DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 155 IR 008 069

TITLE	Issues and Alternatives: A Guide for the Policy Maker.
INSTITUTION	Dallas Public Library, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY	National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	78
GRANT	PD-31871-78-1166
NOTE	140p.; The attached computer printout may not reproduce well
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Age; Bibliographies; City Planning; Education; Fees; *Humanization; *Information Services; Labor Unions; Neighborhood Improvement; *Policy Formation; Public Libraries; *Public Policy; Public Service Occupations; *Social Problems; Transportation; Youth
IDENTIFIERS	*Public Interest Information Network

ABSTRACT

This document describes the policy-oriented information delivery mechanism, the Public Interest Information Network (PIIN), that was developed by the Dallas Public Library to respond to the informational needs of local governments and citizen's groups by compiling sources which can provide a humanistic context for evaluating public policy options. The major part of the document consists of 10 articles, each of which represents a contribution to PIIN from area universities: (1) basic education, (2) public service unions, (3) urban growth issues, (4) user charges and the financing of city services, (5) urban transportation, (6) neighborhoods: their evolving role in urban policy, (7) youth: a humanistic perspective, (8) neighborhood revitalization and displacement: some neglected considerations, (9) public and private sector service provision: an alliance for the future, and (10) the literary view of aging. Suggested readings are listed for each of these topics. Appended are representative computer-generated printouts of searches conducted by PIIN staff to meet the needs of groups who are further along in the policy formation process, who need to identify available community resources and/or materials previously generated by other researchers or policy specialists. The two distinct computerized information systems used in these searches--Community Information Sources (APL/CAT) and National Information Retrieval Services--are described. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183155

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ISSUES AND ALTERNATIVES:
A GUIDE FOR THE POLICY MAKER

by

Public Interest Information Network
Dallas Public Library
Dallas, Texas

IR008069

INTRODUCTION

Joe Hanna, Project Manager
Public Interest Information Network
Dallas Public Library

Located in the heart of the Sunbelt, the north central Texas region is experiencing an accelerating rate of population and economic growth. As a result of a trend towards urbanization, the region, with Dallas-Fort Worth at its center, is faced with the problem of how to respond to this growth in the most effective way. Public policy makers and planners are increasingly dealing with policy questions which will have a permanent effect on the area.

In the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex, there is an increasing tendency to search for more than an economic basis for development; to recognize that aesthetics is a reflection of philosophy; and that the delivery of human services must be sustained by a rationale that reflects philosophies of governments, of values, and of human worth. Much of the demand for a more comprehensive approach to policy decision making has come from local citizen groups dedicated to promoting an awareness of humanistic considerations. Their concern for "quality of life" reflects the search for, if not the articulation of, the humanistic perspectives that help define this quality in public policy decisions.

Recognition of the need for a broader response to policy problems is shared by members of the academic community who feel that the humanities can have a positive impact on the policy making process. Scholars in the humanities believe that they can make their most meaningful contribution by serving as translators in interpreting the humanistic perspective.

As colleague to the academic community and a resource to planners and community groups, the public libraries have begun to examine their role as mediums through which broad-based information systems addressing specific public policy issues could be developed and used. The rapid and profound social changes of the recent past have presented libraries with a new challenge to become information centers, providing access to current and dynamic materials related to pressing social issues. The new technology that has provided the impetus for these changes has also given libraries the means to answer this challenge. However, because the structure of many of these new technologies lends itself so readily to statistical and "hard" data accounting, libraries find themselves facing a further challenge. To fulfill their function as institutions providing cultural continuity, libraries must find a way to integrate information addressing a particular issue - the dynamic data of today and timeless perspective of the humanities - in a way that is both meaningful and useful to those who shape our public policy.

To respond to the informational needs of local governments and citizen's groups, the Dallas Public Library, utilizing grant funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities, established a policy oriented information delivery mechanism. This mechanism, the Public Interest Information Network, was specifically designed to provide guidance and direction in the policy making process. In particular, an effort was made to compile resources which could provide a humanistic context for evaluating public policy options. This information system was designed to link the volatile and dynamic data generated daily with the insights and perspectives of other people, places, and periods. Access to humanities resources, in conjunction with the empirical data that often shapes policy decisions, could thus provide multi-disciplinary perspectives on current issues of public concern. The humanities oriented information base developed by the Public Interest Information Network has provided a readily accessible source for perspectives on policy issues, local community resources, and a listing of relevant print and non-print material addressed to specific policy issues.

The information system developed through the Public Interest Information Network contained three specific components. Each portion of the system was designed to both stand alone and complement other portions of the system. One portion of this information system, the Community Information Source (APL/CAT) was designed to identify local resources and service providers. A second part of the information system, the National Information Retrieval System, was utilized to locate references to research, literature, or studies on specific issues on a national level. Both of these files, however, tend to address "how to" processes and techniques. To address the more basic issues of "why to" or "if to", local scholars in the humanities have developed materials which provide insights into the root issues and questions surrounding a number of policy related topics.

The following ten chapters represent materials developed by contributors from area universities. In each case, an attempt has been made to explore the basic cultural, historical, and value issues underlying the topic addressed. In no case has a contributor recommended "the" solution to an issue. Instead, questions have been raised, values examined, and past processes explained. Answers can come only from the policy maker.

The last section of this publication, the appendix, more fully explains and gives examples of other information resources used by the Public Interest Information Network. Topics addressed through this system ranged from migrant farm workers to cable television, from status offenders to transportation systems for the elderly.

The use of the file in this way has again emphasized the role libraries must play in providing a well-rounded informational base to those who have vital roles in shaping public policy. The impact of historical, philosophical, or ethical perspectives of the following papers can provide a context that removes decision making from expediency to careful consideration.

Funding for the Public Interest Information Network has been provided by the Public Programs Division of the National Endowment for the Humanities (Grant No. PD-31871-78-1166) and the Dallas Public Library. Information developed and provided through this project does not necessarily reflect the position of the National Endowment for the Humanities or the Dallas Public Library.

BASIC EDUCATION

by

Harvey Graff, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Dallas

Introduction

Some of our most pressing concerns, worries, and policy issues remain ill-defined, inadequately understood, and misconceived by many citizens and officials, despite their often pressing nature and the constant attention they receive. Among these, education ranks high. Seldom do we pause to reflect, or to consider alternative formulations, broader definitions, unstated conflicts and contradictions, the impact of change and development, or creative options. Debate and policy-making (implementation too) are restricted severely, of course, by the press of the moment, financial constraints, immediate reactions to specific problems and circumstances. This is hardly surprising; yet, the impact of this mode of procedure and problem solution often reduces and restricts the kinds of thinking which can contribute to new approaches. There are, in fact, perspectives on critical issues which can, usefully if with difficulty, encourage the sorts of rethinking and reconsideration which the urgency of contemporary issues demand. While no easy or automatic answers follow, the significance of these issues demand that we confront different strategies and ask new questions about old, recurring issues. Education offers one of the most important examples.

Origins of Contemporary Attitudes and Institutions

First, it is impossible to confront questions relating to schooling today without understanding the origins of our assumptions and arrangements. There are two principal elements: 1) our heritage stresses a deep faith in popular education, for the greater benefit of state, society, and individual. This derives from intellectual currents embodied in the eighteenth century Enlightment, which were embraced by our "founding fathers," and repeatedly emphasized by their successors. The need for, and the right to, some degree of schooling for all citizens (although we have broadened the definition of who are included since the nineteenth century) has been fundamentally unquestioned. 2) The events of nineteenth century social and educational reformers added a second level. Through their response to a series of social changes and the expansions of public responsibilities, an institutional basis for public education was created. This was a system of interlocking levels of education, graded and differentiated, bureaucratic, free and tax-supported, compulsory, class-biased and racist. In fact, the foundations of the present system were firmly created by the 1880's; they quickly spread throughout the country.

This form of bureaucratic schooling was only one alternative arrangement available to school builders a century or century and one half ago. Other options were present, but through the interaction of historical factors and human choices, the roots of the contemporary system were established. This does not mean, necessarily, that no other alternatives are available today, nor does change require a rejection of our western, democratic and egalitarian faith in public schooling. An understanding of the accompanying assumptions and a systematic comparison of faith and results, in terms of expectations and reality, should be built into policy discussions.

Education, it is safe to say, has acquired many more responsibilities than it was originally developed to meet; much of our present dissatisfaction with schools and schooling follows from unrealistic expectations. In understanding how schools came to be what they are today--and in seeing the tremendous hope we place in education, we may then be able to confront choices and alternatives with a new and more realistic set of goals.

For example, we might seriously ask just what it is that we expect to result from our educational arrangements and how realistic those expectations may be. Similarly, we can ask if other arrangements or differentiated options for students might serve to achieve our goals.

Literacy: One Meaning for Basic Education?

Literacy furnishes an excellent case in point. Uninformed discussion about "literacy in crisis" assaults us from all sides today, from the local press, school boards, and employers to the highest national levels. Few however pause to ask: what is literacy? what do we expect from the achievement of literacy by the young today? is literacy alone sufficient to meet social and economic, and individual, demands? These questions most often are neither asked nor answered; in terms of social consensus or educational policies, we have few precise answers. Instead we have a legacy, which derives from the historical evolution of new ideas from the Protestant Reformation and the eighteenth century Enlightenment; our legacy has supported an uncritical, ideologically-reinforced faith in the power of education (especially that supported by the state in mass institutions) to encourage social and economic development, meliorate social problems, and advance the progress of individuals. Therefore, broad and narrow historical causes merge in the maintenance of belief in the power and efficacy of literacy.

But what is literacy? Literacy, to the surprise of many who are dissatisfied with schooling today, is no more than the abilty to read and write and perhaps to carry out some arithmetic calculations. This is in sharp contrast to the failings we assign to the school in many cases, failings often of a higher qualitative level--failings in the use of literacy. To address problems related to literacy, we must sharpen what we mean in reference to the concept. This confusion has plagued many reform attempts, including those of the present moment.

In addition, despite allusions and pious rhetoric to the contrary, literacy has never been, in actual transmission or expectation, a neutral skill. Schools have never been designed to provide only basic skills; they are expected by nations, states, and local areas to provide instruction in social morality, good citizenship, normative behavior, proper values, and work habits. Literacy, more often than not, becomes the vehicle best suited for mass public education and for the training of the next generation in these critical values and habits. Literacy can often become secondary in practice, and, not surprisingly, training in skills can be therefore less than perfect.

Finally, for most appropriate debate, we need to recognize that literacy, in spite of our belief in it, has never in theory or practice been closely matched with the skills required for successful daily life and rewarding, productive work. So, literacy can take on meanings (both broader and narrower) other than those usually assigned to it. This constitutes only one example, of many, in which critical questions and new definitions are desperately required if clarification and progress are to come.

School, Society, State, and Family: Responsibilities

The relationship between social institutions, the state, and individuals is equally important, and equally needing of attention. Our traditions and evolution of public, state-supported schools rest upon one of the deepest and most often evaded conflicts in American society. This is the question of the division of responsibilities for basic services, morality, and socialization in modern society; it involves the competition of a variety of institutions, from family to state, with schools, church, and other public or private institutions in between--often uncomfortably so. Recent battles over prayers, dress codes, expansion of educational services, and especially sex education, highlight and reinforce the underlying issues. These conflicts, which derive from historical developments and societal change, are not those of the school and its relations alone, but impinge upon many other issues and social institutional relations.

The fact of the matter, and the principal cause of the problem, is that developments and policy decisions to date have been made without often confronting these conflicting issues. It is only when conflict and challenges to family or religious beliefs surface that we face them: in courtrooms, public councils, and commonly in acrimonious debates in which participants seldom listen to each other's opinions and arguments.

Over the past two hundred years we have witnessed a gradual shift in the basis of social welfare and social responsibilities from individuals, families, and local communities to institutions, institutions organized, operated, and supported by larger political-geographical units. Despite rhetoric to the contrary, these institutions have always been actively involved in transmitting morality and social values; schools have seldom ever limited their real curriculum to provision of "neutral" skills of literacy and numeracy. Nevertheless, we continue to believe and to fact policy questions as if the home, the church, and the close community held more total control over moral and personal values and socialization in attitudes and norms.

Today, we need not go to the extremes of many social scientists and consider the family or community to have declined to the point of virtual abandoment of responsibilities and disappearance; equally obviously, religion and its adherents have not vanished either. The result is continued conflict, which erupts with repeated and instructive regularity, and which continues to be avoided and unstated unless challenged by public school prayers or threats of sex education. In practice, the level of conflict and the unwillingness to confront publically and politically these issues has insured that no basic and accepted division of responsibility and coordination of efforts takes place to provide these critical social functions. These issues must be confronted directly; for this - and for clearer policies - there is no alternative.

Compulsory Schooling

Schooling for an arbitrary number of years or up to a specially-agreed upon age or attainment is a social invention. For many centuries, schooling - whether formal or informal, in public, private, or domestic settings - was an occasional and irregular part of the young persons' life cycles. Education was acquired by interactions of social class and wealth, needs for credentials or skills, and personal desires for improvement and advancement.

In the United States, compulsory attendance laws date only from the middle of the nineteenth century; in many states, including Texas, they were passed only in the first decades of the present century. Many reasons are heard for compulsory legislation, including: guarantees to the young for a certain amount of schooling, by legislative fiat; protection of children from parents who had little regard for the child's future and often exploited their children through child laboring arrangements; protection of children from employers, and apprentices from masters, who ignored promises to educate their charges; promotion of social order, citizenship, respect, and work discipline for the future of society; and protecting the young against wayward peers and temptations. Many of these motivations remain today.

In actual fact, the rationales behind compulsion included other, less clearcut motives: labor unions and workers trying to cut out juvenile competition for work which often brought wages down; educators seeking a guaranteed clientele and elevated occupational status; and fears that lower class and immigrants would choose work or peer groups rather than schooling. This complex web of motives must be confronted in evaluating the success of these laws and in considering options to them.

Do ten or twelve years of required schooling benefit equally all children, including those with different background and different aptitudes (attitudes too)? What fears and expectations do maintenance, without change, of these laws represent? Whose interests are best served by compulsory schooling: the students? the schools? the community? the labor force? employers?

There is no evidence that school is the best place for all adolescents; many suffer greater losses than gains. Nor do we know that best learning always takes place when forced upon pain of legal strictures. Alternatives may help to resolve contemporary educational and juvenile problems which threaten school, family, social order, and courts.

Urban Schools: Integration and Segregation

It is only since the Supreme Court's ruling against the doctrine of "separate but equal" schooling in 1954 that our society had begun to confront the problems of segregation in education. We have witnessed a series of alternatives in the past two decades, based in efforts to subvert real integration and others aimed at change, including: boundary-line redrafing; "academies" of a quasi-public, quasi-private nature; arguments about funding and about neighborhood schools; and of course, busing. Public officials, social scientists, and policy analysts continue to debate the efficacy of all these options. as do teachers and especially parents. If there is one point of agreement in an otherwise mass of confusion, it is that virtually all previous efforts have not met with success. To begin to understand the issues requires some additional perspectives.

In the first place, we need to note that social changes and educational change which many desire do not, and have never, followed from legal orders and legislative fiats, or court decrees. These options have all failed, and for many reasons. The problems which such efforts constantly skirt are those rooted in the spatial and economic arrangements of society. Regardless of reform, or law, segregated schooling follows segregated residential patterns; de facto have always been more important than de jure conditions. Unequal tax bases, different parental involvement levels, and different home conditions, deriving from social and economic inequalities underlie the status quo. Complicating the issues are reports that school facilities are not among the more important factors accounting for differences in achievement and "quality" levels. Education cannot compensate for deeper social and economic inequalities; integrated schools cannot compensate for residentially segregated cities and towns; most importantly, schools simply do not have the resources or wherewithall to create a society of class, ethnic, and racial tolerance and social-economic equality of opportunity and achievement. Until we realize the contradictions of the "real world" all such efforts are destined to fail.

Conclusion

These five examples--origins of contemporary attitudes and institutions; literacy; responsibilities of schools, society, state, and families; compulsory education; and integration/segregation--illustrate the significance and implications of my brief introductory remarks. The issues, not surprisingly, are difficult ones. We have not done, however, all that we could have, and should have, in dealing with them and in facing them squarely. The perspectives offered here present some selected examples of the rethinking, redefining, and questioning which is required today, perhaps, more than ever before. The examples are only illustrations; their discussion is only introductory; the purpose is to open debate, rather than to close it off or to promise quick and easy answers: we should not expect that. Further,the perspective presented here is a humanistic one. The attempt is to reflect on basic and critical, continuing issues of social policy in different, but useful ways. Toward this end, the contributions of historical views, value clarification, alternative seeking, new ways of phrasing the issues, and new ways of entering and clarifying debates are stressed. New contexts for the immediate concerns of satisfying partisan bodies, meeting political promises, and allocating scarce resources may be found in this manner. Such an approach can be made to work; only if we wish to meet the needs of our society and ourselves will we take the steps required to implement it and to give it a fair test. Can we doubt that our circumstances demand any less of an effort than this?

SUGGESTED READINGS

1. Bataille, Leon. *A Turning Point for Literary*. New York: Pergaman, 1976.
2. Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. *Schooling in Capitalist America*. New York: Basic, 1976.
3. Cremion, Lawrence A. *The Wonderful World of Ellwood P. Culberly*. New York: Teachers College, 1965.
4. Gitell, M. *Participants & Participation*. New York: Prager, 1967.
5. Goodman, Paul. *Compulsory Mis-Education*. New York: Vintage, 1962.
6. Graff, Harvey J. "Literacy Past & Present: Critical Approaches in the Literacy--Society Relationship," forthcoming paper.
7. Harlan, Louis. *Separate & Unequal*. New York: Atheneum, 1968.
8. Harvard Educational Review, *School Desegration*. University of Chicago Press, 1973.
9. Kaestle, Carl F. "Between the Scylla of Brutal Ignorance & the Charybdis of a Literary Education: "Elite Attitudes," in G. Stone, ed., *Schooling & Society*. Baltimore: John Hopkins, 1976.
10. Katz, Michael B. *Class, Bureaucracy, & Schools*. New York: Praeger, 1975.
11. Katz. "The Origins of Public Education: A Reassessment" *History of Education Quarterly*, 16 (1976), 381-408.
12. Landes, William & Salamon, Lewis. "Compulsory Schooling Legislation." Journal of Economic History, 32 (1972), 36-91.
13. Levin, Henry, ed. *Community Control of Schools*. New York, Brookings Institute, 1970.
14. Railyn, Bernard. *Education in the Forming of American Society*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1960.
15. Rothman, David. *The Discovery of the Asylum*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1971.

16. Stone, Lawrence. "Literacy & Education in England," *Past & Present*, 42 (1969), 61-139.

17. Tyack, David. "Ways of Seeing: An Essay on the History of Compulsory Schooling," *Harvard Educational Review*, 46 (1976), 355-389.

18. Weinberg, Meyer. *A Chance to Learn: History of Race & Education*. New York: Cambridge, 1977.

PUBLIC SERVICE UNIONS

by

Helen Reynolds, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Dallas

An Introduction to Public Service Unions

Public Service unions are organizations whose function it is to act as the advocate for public service workers in any negotiations with the governments that hire those workers. Public service workers comprise a labor group of highly varied types. There are those with skills that are specially suited to work for governments, such as police officers, fire fighters, public school teachers, sanitation workers, welfare and social workers, and postal employees. Then there are those workers with skills that could be used in many different sectors of the economy: carpenters, plumbers, clerks, and truck drivers. Workers engaged in employment for any level of government (federal, state, or local) at non-managerial tasks are considered public service employees. Some of these workers have recently sought to group together in unions or other organizations in order to have a larger voice in decisions about their wages and working conditions.

The term "public service unions" is a catch-all phrase for several types of labor organizations. First of all, there are all public unions, which are unions in the traditional sense (that is, the sense of being collective bargainers), and whose memberships are exclusively composed of public service employees. Examples of all-public unions are the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), and the United Federation of

Postal Clerks. Most all-public unions are associated with the AFL-CIO,[1] and are organized to act as bargaining agents for the corresponding groups of workers.

The second type is the mixed union, which is a union that represents workers from the government sector and from private industry. Generally, these are blue-collar unions of craftsmen, such as carpenters and registered nurses, whose skills can be used by the government as well as by private industry. Examples of mixed unions are the Service Employees International Union (SEIO) and the Teamsters.

The third type of public service union is not officially a union at all. This is the professional association, which does not have the title of a union or, sometimes, even the same goals. Associations are organizations that were initially established to institute pension plans and to foster civil service systems. More recently, however, their purposes have been more like those of unions, in that professional associations have been active in lobbying for legislation that would benefit the members and have been used as the agents for collective bargaining. Examples of this type of "unions" are the National Education Association and police benevolent associations.

What public service unions are seekng to gain for their members is very much the same as unions in private industry. They are primarily seeking to improve working conditions and to increase wages. However, because of the nature of the public services that the workers provide, their aims may have political overtones as well. The political goals of the unions are mainly two types: influence in budgetary decisions over appropriations and influencing policy decisions at the agency level.

---

[1] American Federation of Labor - Congress of Industrial Organizations

The Politics of the Unions

Public service unions try to gain political power by helping elect officials who are sympathetic to their causes. Despite the Hatch Act (passed in 1937, a law prohibiting federal employees from participating in political campaigns) and state-passed "little Hatch Acts," public service employees are vitally interested in which politicians are empowered with decisions about legislation and appropriations. The workers stand to gain or lose a great deal from each year's government budget, and therefore they take an active interest in state and local politics. Just as teachers band together to elect officials who are "for education" and try to depose those who would cut education budgets, public service unions in general support the election of candidates who will strengthen the union members' economic position within the government.

Also, public service unions try to influence the policies of the agencies employing their members. Those policies may include such administrative issues as student-teacher ratios, social worker caseloads, civilian review boards for police, and whether management vacancies are filled from within the agency or from outside. Whether or not the union members, as workers, have a voice in matters of administrative policy is a large issue with many unions. For example, job security and job safety may be as important or more important than pay raises to many workers. How large a voice the union members receive will primarily depend upon the relative bargaining strength of the union versus management plus how important any specific issue is to the union members (and therefore how hard they will fight for it).

Problems in Collective Bargaining

Unions and professional associations provide their primary economic service to the public service workers in the form of collective bargaining. Collective bargaining is the term used to describe the process in which a group of workers band together to have one person or group of persons represent them in negotiating employment contracts with management. At one time it was illegal for government employees (at all levels of government) to bargain collectively. Now all government employees can bargain collectively, although in some states there are still restrictions about the specific bargaining procedures.

Those states that are heavily industrialized and whose populations are therefore unionized have specific state legislation protecting the rights of state and municipal employees. States with less unionization, with more rural and agricultural populations, have not gone to such lengths to encourage public service unions. In those states, mainly in the South, Southwest, and Rocky Mountains, many policy makers may even be hostile to the idea of public service unions. One way that government employees may circumvent some of the hostility is to form "associations" rather than "unions" and to try to gain their demands through political campaigns and/or lobbying activities rather than through collective bargaining.

In most situations, collective bargaining pits the power of the employee negotiating team against that of the management team. How effective each side is depends upon the relative importance of labor to the production of the governmental service and the skill of the negotiators. In agencies that can function for some time without the organized labor (where management takes over the labor positions temporarily), labor may be put into rather poor bargaining position.

On the other hand, if labor can successfully halt production by not working, it is in a relatively good bargaining position. Not to be discounted in the total bargaining process, however, are the relative bargaining skills of the negotiators for both sides, for a good bargainer can compensate for the weakness of his side's economic position.

In government employment there are two peculiar aspects of bargaining that do not appear in private industry. Those peculiarities are:

1. With whom does labor negotiate?
2. Can strikes be used as a threat if negotiations break down?

In private industry, organized labor negotiates with a management team that has been given the power to make specific offers to labor, offers which will be granted by the employing firm. In government employment, however, there is a real question about who should be in charge of negotiations for the management side. The supervisory personnel placed over labor may not be the same people in charge of budget allocations or policy decisions. The union members may even be employed by more than one agency, all which have different budgetary policies. If the negotiators are not the administrators of the budgets, then contracts containing provisions for higher wages or greater fringe benefits may not be within the range of the tax revenue allocations of the budgets. If all of this were not complicated enough, there is the added problem that the management negotiators may be elected or appointed politically and union members are also voters.

To get around this difficulty, one of the more successful plans has been to hire a person or persons whose sole job it is to act as negotiator for the city or state. This is only financially worthwhile if there are many unions and/or negotiations occur frequently; otherwise, the negotiator would need to be used in some other capacity as well, which may work against the concept of a separate office for labor relations. It is probably best that this negotiator be hired from outside the existing personnel, so that no loyalties or animosities have been established when he or she begins negotiations.

The Threat of Strikes

Strikes are among the most powerful economic weapons that unions have to gain their demands. Strikes by public service unions, however, may be effective or may prove to be destructive to those ends. As long as public employees are seen by the voters as "public servants," then the image maintained by the employees may be important in keeping the voters on their side of any negotiations. If a way to gain public support for government employees can be found -- through petitions or referendums, for example -- then any support that has been gained may be withdrawn if the employees do anything to damage their public image.

Strikes by some public employees are illegal, so that the strike or even the threat of strike cannot be used as an effective bargaining tool. However, slowdowns and "work to rule" (performing the minimum required work and no more) tactics may be useful alternatives to the workers who are legally forbidden to strike. Even though unlawful, strikes by these restricted government employees are not unheard of, as the unions try to draw attention to their cause or try to gain a better bargaining position.

Public opinion about strikes has a great deal to do with the type of work that the employees are engaged in and how essential that work is to the community at large. Police and fire protection and public hospital care are generally considered essential services (that is, after all, the primary reason that they are provided to all by the government), so that if those workers went out on strike, there would be some citizens who would not be given emergency services (medical treatment, fires extinguished, or responses to poice calls). To the extent that some of the emergency services can be handled by private firms (private hospitals and protective agencies), a strike by some unions is not as bad as it could be without the existence of the private firms; but for some services (fire fighting and law enforcement), there are no private substitutes. Strikes that impair emergency services tend to create citizen antagonism for the striking public employees.

The public image of a government employee may be important to the success of the service he or she provides. If a strike or threat of strike tarnishes this image, so that public employees appear to be greedy or hungry for power, then the ability of the worker to perform his or her job may be affected. For example, citizens' respect for police officers and school teachers makes those citizens feel comfortable in deferring to authority of the officers and teachers, an attitude which gives them the power to use their discretion in all kinds of situations. Without the same sort of respect, the police officer or the teacher may not have the community support to act freely and therefore may not be able to perform his or her job as well.

Some Questions and Answers About Public Service Unions

1. How successful are public service unions in obtaining higher wages for their members?

The evidence on this question is unclear. To begin with, workers employed by governments tend to earn higher wages than those in comparable positions in private business. Workers in government are usually paid by the "prevailing wage principle," by which they receive wages equal to those paid in private industry. This "prevailing wage," however, may be the highest wage paid a comparable worker, not the average wage or the lowest. Also, if "prevailing wage" means union scale pay, then workers will receive union scale (which is above the pay to non-union members in private industry), while gaining the greater job security that is inherent in public service employment. Within most job catagories, then, studies have shown that public service employees tend to earn higher wages than their counterparts in the private sector. (This is not true, however, of managerial and professional positions, for which the higher echelon workers receive less in government than their peers in the private sector.)

How effective public service unions have been in raising wages can best be cited in the few examples for which evidence can be found. For fire fighters, union members may receive from 6-16% higher wages than non-union workers.[2] For public school teachers, the difference has been found to be no more than 5%.[3] The wage differences in other types of work may vary among jobs and among locales.

2. How costly are strikes?

The cost of strike to a government depends upon how many workers are involved, the importance of the work that is halted, the substitutability of other workers into the vacated jobs, and the duration of the strike. A short strike by fire fighters can be quite costly to a community, while a strike by custodial workers in government buildings would not inflict severe damage.

---

[2] Orley Ashenfelter, "The Effect of Unionization on Wages in the Public Sector: The Case of Fire Fighters," Industrial and Labor Relations Review (January, 1971) pp. 191-202.

[3] D. Frey, "Wage Determinants in Public Schools and the Effects of Unionization," in Labor in the Public and Non-Profit Sectors, ed. D. Hammermesh. Princeton, N.J. Princeton University Press, 1974.

Cities are more heavily affected by strikes and work stoppages than state governments because they provide the majority of public services and therefore employ the majority of those workers. The cost of a strike to a city, in terms of duration, lies in how essential the service is to the city, so that we would assume that strikes affecting the most essential services would result in a resolution of labor negotiations in a short period of time, while municipalities would go without less critical services and not feel as compelled to resolve labor disputes about those services quickly.

In the 1970's, with larger rates of inflation and a tendency for the salaries of many public employees to increase long after those in private industry, the incidence of strikes and stoppages has increased. It would seem to be a general rule that strikes will increase in frequency when local and state governments do not increase wages to their employees at the same rate as the publicized increases received by employees in the private sector.

If the demand for increased wages is a result of inflation, then the fiscal condition of the government may not be too severe, because in most circumstances the inflation will also increase tax revenues (from which the public service employees' wages come). The timing of the tax revenue increases and the wage increases may be important, however; if the increase in tax revenues lags behind the increase in pay, then worker discontent may lead to costly strikes. In some localities, there may be some resistance to increased taxes, even if the tax revenues increase at the same rate as inflation. The Proposition Thirteen type of taxpayer revolt would lead to more slowly increased government pay, as would a decline in tax revenues because of a decaying municipal tax base.[4] In these situations, when tax income to the government cannot meet demands for increased wages, more strikes will occur and will add to the costs of the already burdened local and state governments affected by the decrease in tax money.

3. Is public service unionism inevitable?

Not necessarily. However, there is a trend toward unionization, as the demand for higher standards of living encourage public service workers to press for greater compensation from an increasingly disorganized and inefficient government sector. The formation of unions is not necessarily inevitable in all states at all governmental levels. Some states are more likely candidates for unionization than others, with the difference in likelihood depending upon the current and expected degree of unionization in the population as a whole. As was mentioned earlier, the states that are highly industrialized tend to be strongholds of union power with widespread pro-union sentiment on the part of the citizenry. Those states that are more agricultural tend to be less enthusiastic about unionization in general and in some cases may be described as anti-union.

---

[4] Decay or erosion of a tax base occurs in a municipality when the value of property within the municipality's taxing jurisdiction declines. This can happen if the population of the municipality experiences lower incomes or if the size of the population declines (often when people migrate to cities with better employment opportunities or to the suburbs).

Areas of heavy industrialization, (New England, the Mid-Atlantic states, and East North Central states of the Great Lakes) have a large percentage of their public employees unionized; whereas the other more agricultural states have less unionization. Also, the larger the city is, the more likely that the public service employees are unionized.

What can be said about the inevitability of public service unionism? The outlook seems to point toward greater union organization, particularly in the cities where there is little or no unionism now. There will no doubt be a plateau of unionization in the government sector, just as the degree of unionization has leveled off in recent years in the private sector. Employers will find ways to appease non-union workers in order to avoid unions, sometimes with higher wages and better working conditions. Also, if the degree of unionization in the private sector does not increase, then there may not be a simultaneous increase in public suport for public service unions from the rest of the citizenry. To reiterate, the chance of any city having public service unions will rest on the prevailing political attitude about organized labor (pro-union vs. anit-union) coupled with the relative bargaining strengths of labor versus the city administration.

SUGGESTED READINGS

This paper relied heavily upon Lloyd G. Reynolds, Labor Economics and Labor Relations, 7th edition, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978), Chapter 27, "Bargaining in the Public Sector."

Also recommended for additional material are:

The American Assembly. Public Workers and Public Unions. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Bunker, Charles S. Collective Bargaining in the Non-Profit Sector. Columbus, Ohio: Grid, Inc., 1973.

Flynn, Ralph J. Public Work, Public Workers. Washington, D.C.: The New Republic Book Co., Inc., 1975.

Hoeh, David C., editor. Collective Bargaining in the Public Sector. Hanover, N.H.: The Public Affairs Center, Dartmouth College, 1968.

Hershey, Cary. Protest in the Public Sector. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1973.

Marx, Herbert L., Jr., editor. Collective Bargaining for Public Employees. New York: The H.W. Wilson Company, 1969.

Spero, Sterling D. and John M. Capozzola. The Urban Community and Its Unionized Bureaucracies. New York: Dunellen Publishing Co., Inc., 1973.

Stanley, David T. Managing Local Government under Union Pressure. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1972.

Stieber, Jack. Public Employee Unionism: Structure, Growth, Policy. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1973.

Walsh, Robert E. Sorry...No Government Today: Unions vs. City Hall. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

Warren, Kenneth O. and Mary L. Hennessy. Public Management at the Bargaining Table. Chicago: Public Personnel Association, 1967.

Wellington, Harry H., and Ralph K. Winter, Jr. The Unions and the City. The Brookings Institution, 1971.

URBAN GROWTH ISSUES

by

Kerry D. Vandell, Ph.D.

Southern Methodist University

The phenomenon of urban growth has been a dynamic of substantial consequence in American society since it first gained impetus with the Industrial Revolution in the latter nineteenth century. The rates and patterns of growth--as manifest in the built environment, human habitation, and economic activity--have a profound impact on the quality of life and the potential for economic development. Therefore, growth and its manipulation have become policy issues of considerable interest.

Since the two objectives of quality of life and economic development are related and sometimes in conflict, growth has also become the scene of a battle between "anti-growth" and "pro-growth" advocates. Jay Forrester, in his monograph Urban Dynamics, first elaborated on the question of whether economic and population growth were compatible or necessary for increased standards of living in a market economy--questions which had been raised earlier by philosophers and economists such as Malthus. The battle has recently been joined at the metropolitan level by growth advocates, who point out the high correlation between intensive and growing economic activity, population growth, and quality of life indicators in American metropolitan areas, and by growth critics, who maintain that a positive relationship between growth and quality of life is by no means automatic, and that there are numerous examples where rampant economic and population growth has been accompanied by increased air, water, and noise pollution; traffic congestion; rising prices; increasing pressures on a governmental institutions; increased crime; and deterioration of the infrastructure and housing stock.

The extent to which individual communities and metropolitan areas will choose to (or be able to) control their economic and population growth is uncertain at the present time and being decided in the courts. The following discussion examines current growth trends in this country and the various policy tools--both traditional zoning techniques and more elaborate measures--being applied to effect some measure of control over growth. Their advantages and disadvantages are also weighed, as is their potential impact.

Growth Trends:

American urban areas are giving every indication that they are entering a new era in urban growth dynamics. From the late nineteenth century, and especially since the Second World War, the dominant pattern of growth has been one of increasing decentralization of employment and population into new developments on the suburban fringe of the metropolitan area. However, the 1970's have seen the emergence of two new trends: (1) revitalization of the older inner core city and (2) rural growth and growth of smaller communities in non-metropolitan areas.

Inner-city neighborhoods throughout the country are experiencing a "rebirth," as households--generally younger working couples without children--opt for single family residential properties near employment and cultural centers downtown rather than moving to the suburbs. Spurred on by a "bulge" of demand in this age group and increasing energy costs, such movement has been concentrated in somewhat less deteriorated neighborhoods with interesting architectural styles. The result has been conversion of large boarding house back to single famiy occupancy and actual population declines but a very real growth in value of the housing stock and incomes in such areas. There is some question as to how far this revitalization will proceed (an Urban Institute study indicates the movement will neither be widespread nor permanent in many areas), but there is no doubt that it is currently proceeding with due haste.

The second new growth trend, the growth of smaller communities, is a response by industry to the new "footlooseness" created by the Interstate Highway system and improved communications and a response by households to preferences for living in a more personal small town rather than in an "anonymous" suburb. The Census Bureau has found that for the first time between 1970 and 1975 there was net migration into the nation's non-metropolitan areas; a total of 1.8 million individuals migrated there from metropolitan areas during that time. Altogether, the nation's non-metropolitan areas enjoyed a 6.6 percent growth rate during 1970-75, compared to a 4.1 percent rate for metropolitan areas.

The above growth trends are recent, but a number of earlier trends are also continuing. The central city is being dominated by service industries, retailing is moving to the outer freeway "loops," and industry is seeking a more rural environment. Older urban areas are growing little, if at all, and of the largest urban areas, only those which are relatively young and in the south or southwest are experiencing much growth. A definite interegional movement of jobs and people from the older industrialized areas of the Northeast and upper Midwest to the cities of the "sunbelt" has been detected. Black migration is continuing from the rural South, but the destination of black households is increasingly becoming the cities of the South rather than those of the Northeast or Midwest. The concentration of low-income minority households in deteriorated central city neighborhoods is increasing, although their absolute numbers are dropping. An increasing share of the nation's population continues to live in urban regions and under urban economies, although these regions are becoming less concentrated and less dense.

These growth dynamics point up a number of policy issues: declining areas are experiencing problems of resource losses; growing areas require additional resources to provide for increased service needs; finally, areas which are becoming the major destinations of the poor require special attention. Dealing with these needs requires a national policy on urban growth and development which is administered locally in response to individual situations. During the early 1970's a federal "New Towns" program was instituted which was designed to redistribute population into smaller independent urban centers rather than suburban communities. It did not succeed, in spite of the fact that households have exhibited a preference for living in smaller communities. The failure was due to a number of factors, including downturns in the national economy, lack of government commitment, and reduction of housing subsidy support, but, it pointed out the need for a comprehensive and stable national urban growth policy.

The Administration's recently proposed urban policy is designed in part to respond to this need--however, it tends to target aid to the declining cities of the Midwest and Northeast to enable them to hold their job base, rather than to encourage mobility toward developing job bases, and smooth transition to new economies. Some have argued this constitutes a "subsidization of inefficiency," eventually to result in higher costs for all. Whether it will or not depends upon whether the growth dynamics which are currently taking place are primarily the result of public policies, or of technological forces beyond the power of government to influence significantly.

Growth Management:

In response to perceived growth trends, local jurisdictions and metropolitan areas have developed a number of policy tools designed to allow the management of growth in a way most beneficial to them. One of the earliest, and certainly the most common of these is zoning; however, since the

1960's a number of others, designed to respond to certain of the limitations of zoning, have been proposed and are in the process of adoption and court evaluation. The following discussion first describes and evaluates the zoning process as it is currently practiced today and then proceeds to a description and evaluation of some of the most commonly proposed alternatives.

Zoning

Since the adoption of the first comprehensive zoning ordinance in New York City in 1916, and especially since the approval by the Supreme Court of zoning as a proper exercise of the police power of local governments (Euclid v. Ambler, 1926), zoning has become by far the dominant form of urban land use regulation in the U.S. today. Derived originally from earlier German land use regulations, the practice of zoning involves restrictions on land use by local government in conformance with an officially adopted zoning map. The zoning map is intended to segregate uses in such a manner that property values are not adversely affected by nearby non-conforming activities, yet at the same time to allow the "highest and best use" of a parcel of land and permit sufficient land for all economic activities within the city. "Euclidean" zoning is the most common method by which these goals are intended to be achieved. It involves a hierarchy of land use designations--from heavy industrial to single family residential--which are not mutually exclusive in their permitted use, but instead are "cumulative," with all activities permitted in a heavy industrial zone, all but heavy industrial in a light industrial zone, etc. The zoning ordinance is usually administered locally by a commission usually appointed by the mayor and/or city council and often composed of citizens familiar with the development process such as real estate industry representatives. Decisions made by the commission with respect to zoning changes or permitting of non-conforming uses are appealable to the city council and ultimately to the courts.

Zoning has come under heavy criticism in the last 20 years for a number of reasons. First it is inflexible and does not allow creative flexibility in design or land use mixing. It is a highly political process, which provides the potential for graft; it often is only applied within municipal boundaries, leaving surrounding areas unregulated and resulting in inconsistencies between communities. It sometimes results in "over" or "under" zoning. It cannot go so far as to constitute a "taking" of property. It can be used to exclude low-and moderate-income households. Furthermore, the final step in the appeals review process is in the courts, which have little professional competence in such matters. And finally, it is designed primarily to serve as a regulatory tool to prevent adverse change in already built-up areas rather than as a tool of growth management on the suburban fringe. In attempting to regulate fringe development, it often mispredicts the market, resulting in inefficiencies and ineffective regulation of growth.

Advanced Growth Management Tools

The unprecedented growth which has taken place in America's urban centers since the Second World War has resulted in a numer of benefits, including large volumes of construction, new housing opportunities, an increasing tax base and new spacious living environments. However, it has also created a number of problems, including increased service needs, overloaded service systems (schools, sewers, police, fire, etc.), inability to "get on top of" new development and plan soundly for it, "rootless" attitudes among the highly mobile population, increased traffic congestion, and declining inner-city real estate markets.

In an attempt to mitigate the adverse effects of growth and to remedy the above-described inadequacies of zoning in dealing with it, a number of jurisdictions and states have proposed or adopted various "growth management" policies which are in the process of being tested in the courts. Examples include: (1) the town of Petaluma, California, which adopted a limitation on additions to the housing stock; (2) the village of Mount Laurel, New Jersey, which adopted large-lot single-family zoning restrictions to reduce the rate of construction and prevent the development of smaller homes and apartments; (3) the county of Fairfax, Virginia, which adopted a "sewer moratorium" to allow the county time to plan for growth; (4) the state of Florida, which has required comprehensive growth management plans on the part of all communities; and (5) the state of California, which has strictly regulated wetlands development. In addition, a number of communities and states have introduced the concepts of transfer of development rights, statewide zoning, public sector land banking, and public sector development agencies to provide regulatory authority over land use and growth. No one of these alone is, of course, the sole answer to the complex problem of regulating urban growth in an equitable and socially desirable manner. Rather, the answer lies in a variety of tools, competence on the part of public sector agencies, flexibility, a spirit of cooperation between the public and private sector, and strong input from all sectors of the community.

Attacks on these policies have come from developers and builders who feel such policies unfairly restrict their activity, and from spokesmen for minorities and low-and moderate-income households who contend the policies eliminate housing opportunities for such families. However, communities have defended them, contending that those restrictions upon mobility and the free market mechanism which are associated with these measures are more than offset by the benefits of orderly, regulated efficient growth. There is little doubt that regulatory processes must be developed in growth areas to minimize the adverse private and social costs which occur as by-products of unbridled development. However, to accomplish this goal without being discriminatory is difficult and requires constant input and evaluation from all sectors of the community.

Conclusions:

Whether growth will continue in this country, at least for the next 50-100 years, is no longer a question, since the population is expected to continue to increase. The relevant question is rather how that growth will be channeled--whether to central cities, suburban jurisdictions, smaller communities, or rural areas--and what role public policies will play in managing that growth. The answers have significant implications for the long term shape of American society, the quality of life, and levels of economic activity. As such, they must be consciously, logically, and carefully planned by citizens and governments at all levels.

SUGGESTED READINGS

1. Babcock, Richard F. *The Zoning Game*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1966.
2. Barnes, Peter. "How to Use Land," *The New Republic*, Sept. 21, 1974, pp. 10-12.
3. Birch, David. *The Economic Future of City and Suburb*, New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1970.
4. Bosselman, Fred P. and Callies, David. *The Quiet Revolution in Land Use Controls*, CEQ, Washington, D.C., 1972.
5. Forrester, Jay. *Urban Dynamics*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1969.
6. Hoover, Edgar M. and Vernon, Raymond. *Anatomy of a Metropolis*, Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1962.
7. Isard, Walter and Caughlin, Robert E. *Municipal Costs and Revenues Resulting from Community Growth*, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, 1972.
8. Marcus, Norman and Graves, Marylin W. The New Zoning, New York: Praeger, 1970.
9. Mills, Edwin S. *Studies in the Structure of the Urban Economy*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1972.
10. Reps, John W. "Requiem for Zoning," in H. W. Eldredge, *Taming Megalopolis*, Vol. II. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1967, pp. 746-760.
11. Scott, Randall. *The Management and Control of Growth*, Washington: Urban Land Institute, 1975.
12. Siegan, Bernard. Land Use Without Zoning, Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1972.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Annual Presidents Report on Urban Growth. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

USER CHARGES AND THE FINANCING OF CITY SERVICES

by

R. D. Norton, Ph.D.

Mount Holyoke College

Introduction

California's Proposition 13 can be viewed as less a reaction to government in general than a revolt against burdensome local property taxes. Both the California episode and subsequent movements in other states highlight a key issue in city government finance. To what extent can cities and towns draw upon other revenue sources to reduce their reliance on the traditional tax source?

This paper considers user charges as an alternative to property taxes. It describes the conditions under which charges are technically feasible, summarizes their growth as a source of city revenue, and examines their economic characteristics.

In outline, we will find that user charges are practicable only for programs whose benefits are privately (i.e., not collectively) consumed, and for which collection costs are low relative to revenue yields. For such technically feasible services, the decisive considerations may then become political in character. How will city residents view a move by city officials to charge fees for previously "free" (that is, tax-financed) city services? Also, are user charges less fair to low-income families than tax-financing?

WHEN ARE USER CHARGES FEASIBLE?

It is often said that city governments should be run in a business-like manner, according to sound business principles. The implication is that city services are like privately produced services and can be "sold" to the people receiving them. By this standard, municipal programs should be designed to meet the demands of city residents for, say, garbage collection or parks. And such programs should be managed efficiently, so that the costs of producing a given service are at least matched by the benefits consumers receive from it.

Why, then, doesn't government always use prices to finance public services? One answer is that not all public services lend themselves to pricing. Where public services are collectively consumed (like national defense or city police protection), the reason government provides them in the first place is that the price mechanism breaks down, in an example of what economists call market failure. It is in the nature of such "pure public goods" that providing them to anyone makes their benefits available to everyone--including free riders who offer no payment.[1]

For such collectively consumed services, private individuals desire the service in question, but only government can provide it. Only government, that is, has the authority to levy taxes on the population at large so as to pay for the costs of production.

But if such pure public goods as police and fire protection must be tax financed, many other types of local services can be paid for by public prices--i.e., by charges collected from the users of the services. Not only parks and garbage collection, but city water systems, parking, and a striking variety of other public services are sometimes financed by user charges. To illustrate this point, it will prove useful to consider the origins and growth of user charges--and to assess their present prominence in municipal budgets.

THE GROWING IMPORTANCE OF SERVICE CHARGES IN CITY BUDGETS

The use of service charges by city governments began in the 19th century with city-operated utilities. In the 1840's, New York City used water charges to amortize a new municipal reservoir.[2] This precedent was eventually followed by other cities--first slowly, then, in the Progressive Era, at an accelerated pace.[3]

It is to that age of municipal reform, covering roughly the years from 1900 to 1916, that we can trace most of today's city-operated utilities. The reform movement led city governments to get into the business of running gas and electric utilities (like Cleveland's now controversial power and light facility) and transit systems as well as water supplies. Their continuing importance can be gauged by the fact that they brought municipal governments over $10 billion in Fiscal 1977.

Since World War II, city governments have also come to raise large amounts of revenue from "current" charges--meaning non-utility service charges. From a token two or three percent in 1940, such revenue had risen to 14 percent of all the revenue cities raised from their own sources in the 1977 fiscal year. In absolute terms, the yield current charges brought city governments reached nearly $7 billion.

This explosive growth in revenue from current charges reflects their extension to an expanding list of local services. Some big-city governments now impose charges for hospitals, airports, housing, colleges, highways, parks, marinas, parking, and school lunches, along with the traditional utilities functions (water, gas and electricity, and transit systems). For the nation's largest cities (the 46 with populations of more than 300,000), current charges accounted for about $3 billion in Fiscal 1977, or not much less than the amount they earned in utilities revenue.

CHARGES WITHIN THE REVENUE SYSTEMS OF TEXAS AND NORTHEASTERN CITIES

Some cities rely more heavily on user charges than others. To be more specific, charges tend to loom larger in the budgets of young cities than in those of the declining older cities. This tendency is illustrated in which lists the current charges share of the general revenue 12 cities raised themselves in Fiscal 1977. (In other words, utilities revenue is omitted from the comparison.)

The table compares the six Texas cities of more than 300,000 residents with the six Northeastern cities in this same size class. It reveals that the Texas cities tended to have somewhat larger revenue shares from charges than did the older cities of the Northeast. Specifically, the average share for the younger group was 22 percent of own-sources general revenue. By contrast, the average for the declining older cities was less than half that, at some 10 percent.

Surprisingly, some of the older cities in fact collect just as much if not more in current charges per capita as the Texas municipalities. The reason charges revenue nevertheless looms larger in the younger cities is that they collect sharply less tax revenue per capita than their Northeastern counterparts. Hence their generally comparable per capita revenues from user charges account for higher proportions of their smaller total revenue amounts.

In sum, major Texas cities have lower per capita taxes and rely more heavily on user charges than major Northeastern cities. This contrast is intriguing because it dovetails with a key locational distinction between taxes and charges. City tax increases may hurt a city's competitive position relative to neighboring localities. By contrast, insofar as charges are viewed as prices for public services, they will not affect location decisions. To see why, we need to take a closer look at the resemblance between charges and prices.

TABLE 1

CURRENT CHARGES IN THE BUDGETS OF TEXAS AND NORTHEASTERN CITIES

Fiscal 1977

City	Current charges as a share of own-sources general revenue	Current charges per capita
Austin	33%	$110
El Paso	24	36
Fort Worth	23	50
San Antonio	20	26
Houston	18	48
Buffalo	15	49
Dallas	15	42
Boston	14	113
New York	13	134
Philadelphia	12	53
Pittsburgh	4	8
Newark	3	13

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, City Government Finances in 1976-77 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978), Table 8.

USER CHARGES AS PRICES

Unlike mandatory tax payments, service charges are made quid pro quo, in exchange for an immediate benefit the user receives. The consumer of the service pays the fee, indicating that he or she values the service by at least as much as is being charged. For this reason, economists say that the consumer is "revealing a preference" for the service by voluntarily paying the fee.

From an efficiency standpoint, charges thus function as prices. Payment of a service charge provides information about the demand for government services. By contrast, tax payments provide no such immediate signals about how consumers value, say, local schools. As a result, voters' preferences regarding school expenditures can be registered only through cruder mechanisms, like school bond elections.

To a limited extent, a government may approximate a service charge through the use of "benefit" taxes. Consider, for example, the gasoline taxes many states and the federal government impose. Such excise taxes are closely linked to the public's use of highways and are earmarked for federal and state highway expenditures. Since gasoline purchases necessarily vary with highway use, this benefit tax resembles a service charge assessed against highway users--albeit one that is collected at gas stations, rather than tollbooths.

In practice, however, the link between city taxes and service benefits is far less certain that this example might suggest. City taxpayers probably do not regard property taxes as prices for specific city services. In particular, rising city tax rates will seldom be matched by improved service levels.

The upshot, then, is that city residents will typically view taxes as more onerous than service charges. If so, a city government could seemingly improve its competitive position by substituting service charges for existing tax-financed programs.

There are certainly tax-financed city programs that would lend themselves to any such shift. For example,

> Consider only one department, health, which could charge prices that fully reimburse the department for the costs of birth registration, marriage examination, laboratory tests, investigation of animal bites, animal quarantines, rabies shots, operation of drug and alcohol rehabilitation centers, immunization for foreign travel, legal abortions, therapy and inpatient care for mental patients, rehabilitation of outpatients, prenatal services for expectant parents, and a host of licenses.[4]

ARE USER CHARGES UNFAIR?

Still, there are some obvious political barriers to the extension of this financing method to additional city services. One is simply public opposition to paying fees for services that have been viewed as free. Texans, for example, resent tolls on highway use. Students at New York's City University long resisted the introduction of tuition charges. In these and similar cases, implementing charges will impose burdens that are either newly recognized or resented as net additions to existing tax payments.

A second and in some instances decisive political objection to user charges is that they fall as heavily on the poor as on the rich. This point may already have occurred to the reader in connection with hospital services. Libraries and schools are also examples of activities that could be financed via charges, but are not likely to be for reasons of social policy.

Consider the case of local schools. As private schools illustrate, education is a service that can be sold at prices covering the costs of its production. Why, then, should governments finance schools through tax payments?

The answer can be put in technical terms, but what it amounts to is that free elementary and secondary education is viewed by the majority of the population as a pillar of American democracy. In this view, public school systems have traditionally offered a foothold for even the poorest children in the society. Putting a price tax on service that seems to represent the only hope for advancement to such children would strike most people as preverse. In this instance, the role of charges as rationing devices would mean that the service would be withheld from those who needed it most. So much is obvious, but it illustrates a key point.

CONCLUSIONS

To what extent can user charges be substituted for city property taxes? On the matter of technical feasibility, most city services (excepting police and fire protection) could be financed at least in part via service charges. Whether charges make sense on technical grounds will depend on the revenue yield they earn in relation to their collection costs, and the costs of excluding non-payers.

Whether charges should be used in lieu of property taxes involves an additional consideration: who gains and who loses from the shift? That, of course, is a political issue, not a technical one. As such, city officials will deal with it in diverse ways. What is clear, however, is that charges constitute a serious alternative to ever-higher property taxes. Considering the widespread backlash against this traditional revenue source, we can probably expect to find an increasing reliance on user charges by city governments.

SUGGESTED READINGS

1. Musgrave, Richard A. and Musgrave, Peggy B. Public Finance in Theory and Practice (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976), chapter 3.
2. Tax Foundation, Special Assessments and Service Charges in Municipal Finance (New York: 1970), pp. 6-7.
3. Griffith, Ernest S. A History of American City Government: 1900-1920 (New York: Praeger, 1974), chapter 7.
4. Hirsch, Werner Z. The Economics of State and Local Government (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970), pp. 45-46.

URBAN TRANSPORTATION

by

Ronald Briggs, Ph.D.

University of Texas at Dallas

What are the basic issues surrounding the urban transportation problem? No two people would probably agree on all of them, let alone their resolution. Nevertheless, it is important to attempt some clarification. To do so, a series of questions can be posed which frequently arise when the urban transportation problem is discussed.

How do people get around in urban areas at present? To a degree which many people do not realize, the automobile dominates urban transportation. In the greater Dallas area 89 per cent of households owned one or more automobiles in 1970, in Fort Worth the figure was 91per cent. Both figures will be higher today. Public transit is most commonly used in the journey to work, yet in 1970 93 per cent of Dallas residents used the automobile for this trip, and 97 per cent of Fort Worth residents did likewise. Although an upturn in the number of trips made by public transit occurred during the Arab oil embargo of 1973-74, ending a continuous 27 year decline, ridership has not increased by any significant amount since that time despite major federal investments in new and improved public transit equipment.

Is the American reliance on the automobile an irrational love affair? Many writers have argued that the dominance of the automobile in urban transportation is a consequence of some emotional or psychological attachment between man and machine. While not denying this may be true, the very real advantages of the automobile as a transportation mode should not be forgotten. These include widespread ownership, versatility as to where it can go, prompt availability when a trip is desired, rapid travel time, comfort, privacy, control of the interior environment, etc. Even though automobile travel is seen as increasingly expensive, in fact, the price of an automobile today (May, 1979), relative to real income, is considerably less than it was in the nineteen fifties. Similarly, the price of gasoline needs to exceed $1.00 a gallon before it equals the real price being paid at that time. Furthermore, automobile use is not a uniquely American phenomena. In European cities with excellent transit, long traditions of transit use, high gasoline prices, heavily taxed automobiles, and lower incomes than prevail in the U.S., as family incomes have risen transit use has declined and auto use has increased.

What is the urban transportation problem? Failure to address this question is a major cause of confusion in debates on urban transportation because people see the problem from different perspectives. There are at least four interrelated, but in many respects quite distinct, dimensions to the urban transportation problem:

(1) Peak-period congestion on highways. For those able to use it, in the most part the highway system provides execellent mobility, far better than public transportation could hope to give. Automobile mobility problems really only arise at rush hour.

(2) Inadequate mobility for non-automobile users. Heavy reliance on the automobile and inadequate public transportation in many areas severely restricts the mobility of those unable to use the automobile--the young, elderly, handicapped and poor--or those who prefer not to use the automobile.

(3) Negative side effects of the automobile. These include traffic fatalities and injuries at the personal level, air pollution, noise and disruption through highway construction at the neighborhood level, and, some people would argue, inefficient land use, inner city decay and suburbanization at the city level.

(4) Energy consumption. The rapidly rising price of gasoline, and uncertainties regarding its future availability, is a potential problem for urban areas, but even more so for rural areas.

How much support esists for public transportation? In the nineteen seventies general public sentiment shifted from hostility or indifference to the concept of public transportation to widespread support. This shift, confirmed in several recent polls, has caught many decision makers by surprise. Although ironical in light of the meagre ridership public transit receives, the paradox is readily explainable. Mass transit appeals, but for very different reasons, to the entire spectrum of political opinion. To the automobile user it promises reduced highway congestion; to the poor, elderly and handicapped it promises mobility; to the liberal it promises more economical transportation for the needy; to the city advocates it promises downtown rejuvenation, and to the environmentalist it promises reduced air pollution and greater energy efficiency. In short, it is seen as the solution to all of the dimensions of the urban transportation problem. Unfortunately, these expectations may not be met.

Will improved public transportation reduce highway congestion? This is the hope of many public transportation supporters, but consider the following. Congestion has always been a feature of large cities, irrespective of the prevalent transportation mode. Cities which presently possess well developed public transportation systems (New York, Chicago, London, Tokyo, etc., as well as smaller cities similar in size to Dallas-Fort Worth) have highly congested highways. The annual growth in highway trips frequently equals the total number of trips made per annum by mass transit. Many automobile users support public transportation because they hope the other guy will use it. Consequently, it is unlikely that improved public transportation will have any noticeable effect on highway congestion.

Realistically, what public transportation can provide is an alternative to the congestion experienced particularly on the journey to work in the downtown area. Increased highway capacity is unlikely to alleviate this problem, but mass transit could provide a time-saving alternative. However, it is essential that the system have its own right-of-way, separated from other vehicular traffic. Otherwise, it will have no significant advantage over the automobile and limited patronage will ensue. Even so, advantages will only pertain to the mass transit user. It is unlikely that highway congestion will be reduced.

Can improved public transportation meet the needs of the elderly and handicapped? Advocates of public transportation point to its critical role in providing mobility for groups unable to use the automobile, such as the elderly and handicapped. Current federal requirements ensure vehicles are more accessible to people with physical mobility impairments. While this may be a move in the right direction, is an expanded public transportation system using these vehicles a complete solution? One problem not solved is that of reaching public transit stops. At least for a subset of the elderly and handicapped, door to door service, which traditional public transportation does not provide, is an absolute necessity. This suggests the need for some form of dial-a-ride service for the elderly and handicapped.

Will improved public transportation alleviate the negative impacts of the automobile on the urban environment? Again, this is a major reason why many people advocate public transit. To achieve this goal requires substantial numbers of people to abandon their automobiles and use mass transit. Given the advantages the automobile has for the individual, and given how few people currently use mass transit, this is unlikely to occur through voluntary choice. Direct restrictions on automobile use, consciously planned or forced through gasoline shortages or rationing (and not simply price increases) will probably be needed. In the absence of such restrictions, the negative impacts of the automobile on the urban environment are perhaps best attacked at their source--through vigorous advocacy and enforcement of automobile emission standards and allowable noise levels, for instance.

Will public transportation save downtown? Perhaps here we are damned if we do and damned if we don't. While good mass transit will make it possible to get downtown more easily, if extended to the suburbs it will also make it easier for people, along with their tax money, to live in suburbia. On the other hand, failing to deal with automobile congestion in the downtown could result in the migration of offices to suburban locations, destroying the current basis of the downtown. To the extent that freeways have already opened the stable door to suburbanization, we are probably left with no choice but to provide a new way into the downtown stable. At the same time, we should push for revitalization through downtown residential development. This is perhaps the real key to the rebirth of the inner city as a genuine community.

Will improved public transportation save energy? Obviously, a fully loaded bus or rail car is more energy efficient, mile for mile, than a single occupant automobile. Unfortunately, this is often the only comparison made, but we must also consider the average occupancy of vehicles, (for instance, a bus or rail car makes the return rush hour trip virtually empty), the energy consumed in construction and manufacturing, the more circuitous route followed by public transit than the automobile, and the use of the automobile to reach mass transit stops. When these factors are taken into account, mass transit saves considerably less energy than is commonly supposed. In fact, a recent Congressional Budget Office study suggested that vanpooling and carpooling saves the greatest amount of energy, followed by traditional bus transit--and heavy rail transit (that is, a subway/elevated type system) may increase energy consumption. Getting people to switch to smaller, more energy efficient automobiles is likely to be far easier, and save far more energy because of the large proportions of trips made by automobile, than getting them to switch transportation modes.

What are the economics of urban transportation? Currently, only fifty per cent of the revenue needed to meet the operating expenses of local public transit comes from the fare box--the other fifty percent comes from federal, state and local government subsidies. In addition, about eighty per cent of capital equipment expenditures are federally funded. It is highly unlikely that public transit can be made to pay for itself. Given this, some people have argued for free public transit as a major incentive for the use of the system. Although not as radical as it appears, since the system is already fifty per cent government supported, the impact would not be as dramatic as might be expected. Experimentation with free systems has increased ridership by as much as fifty per cent, or more. Even so, the number of trips involved is small relative to those made by automobile. While it might be expected that free transit would be most attractive to a motorist paying an average of .30¢ per mile (or more) to operate an automobile (1979 estimate), this is not necessarily the relevant comparison. Because many automobile costs are incurred whether or not the car is used (such as insurance, depreciation, and periodic servicing), the cost of an extra auto trip is little more than the gasoline consumed--which many people apparently feel is well worth the convenience the automobile provides.

What types of public transportation systems are feasible? Most people view public transportation as subway/elevated rail systems (heavy rail, or rail rapid transit), streetcars (light rail) or buses operating on city streets along predetermined routes at fixed time intervals. In addition, modifications to traditional systems, new technology modes, and paratransit should be considered. Heavy rail requires very high traffic volumes (20,000 people per hour per direction) for successful operation. Light rail--an updated street car operating on its own right of way--can successfully operate at lower travel volumes than heavy rail (down to 4,000 people per hour per direction), yet it is cleaner, quieter, faster, and more comfortable than a bus. Buses offer route flexibility, and when operated on dedicated street or freeway lanes, they can be partially separated from automobile congestion. The construction of transit ways provides complete separation, and also allows for future conversion to light rail or heavy rail operation should developments justify. The critical question in the Dallas-Fort Worth area is whether fixed guideway systems (such as heavy rail or light rail) can offer a sufficient advantage over the automobile to attract patronage volumes necessary to justify their existence. If not we should rely on more flexible and less capital intensive bus systems.

New technologies are unlikely to make a major contribution to urban public transportation in the immediate future. Automated guideway transit, of which monorails and the AIRTRANS system are examples, has received considerable popular interest, but the technology is insufficiently developed, and the economics not at all clear, to provide reliable city wide transportation. Circulation within activity centers, such as the downtown, is likely to be their major role. Paratransit, which calls for the more imaginative use of existing, low capital intensive technologies, holds considerable promise for matching a "public" transportation system with people's mobility needs. Although the results of initial experimentation with vanpooling, carpooling, jitneys, shared cabs and dial-a-ride have been mixed, these can certainly be a supplement, perhaps even an alternative, to the automobile and traditional mass transit, which are frequently seen as the only possibilities for urban transportation.

What is the relationship between public transportation and density of urban development? Although recently advocates of public transit have tried to play it down, an important relationship exists between successful public transportation operation and density of urban development. Successful mass transit operation generally depends upon the existence of relatively high residential population densities, and/or significant movements to single central points, such as downtown. For example, the Lindenwold line in New Jersey is frequently cited as an example of a successful transit line operating in a low density environment, but it is seldom mentioned that the line terminates in downtown Philadelphia.

The reason for the importance of high densities is easy to appreciate. Few people are willing to walk very far to reach a public transit stop--seldom more than two or three blocks. If a bus or rail line is to obtain sufficient patronage to operate at reasonable cost levels a considerable number of people must live within that radius--that is, population density must be fairly high. If people have to use an automobile to reach a mass transit stop, they will make the entire trip by car unless congestion at their destination is a major problem--and this usually only occurs in sufficient magnitudes in the downtowns of large cities. Dial-a-ride systems were advocated in the early nineteen seventies as a solution to public transportation in low density suburban areas. Operating like shared taxicabs, they would provide door-to-door transportation equivalent to that of the automobile. Unfortunately, demonstration programs showed them to be very expensive (little cheaper than a taxicab) and energy inefficient.

Will improved public transportation generate the density of development necessary for its successful operation? Recognizing the importance of the relationship between density and successful mass transit operation, it has been argued that the provision of mass transit--especially fixed guideway systems such as transit ways or rail lines--will itself generate the necessary densities. Certainly, these densities will not materialize if we continue to rely on the automobie. However, the low population densities exemplified by present day suburbia may be a reflection of preferences for low density, large lot, single family dwellings. The provision of public transportation will do nothing to change these preferences, consequently low density environments are likely to continue as long as the automobile is available to service them.

How can future urban growth be accomodated? Much of our thinking about future urban transportaion needs in the Dallas-Fort Worth area is underlain by the implicit assumption that we will continue to experience the population growth rates which have prevailed in the nineteen sixties and nineteen seventies. How valid is this belief? If we look at national trends we find that the dramatic decline in the birth rate which occurred in the late sixties and into the seventies has slowed population increase. The nation will probably reach zero population growth in the second or third decade of the twenty first century. Even more significant is the fact that non-metropolitan areas are growing faster than metropolitan areas at present--a complete reversal of earlier trends. Furthermore, most of the nation's largest metropolitan areas are stable or declining in population--and here we are referring not just to the central cities but to the entire metropolitan area encompassing both central city and suburb. Dallas-Fort Worth--one of the nation's larger metropolitan complexes--continues to grow because of its sunbelt location. However, it is a very distinct possibility that the population stability/decline situation which characterizes most of the nation's larger metropolitan areas will prevail in the Dallas-Fort Worth region in the not-too-distant future.

Furthermore, we should perhaps recognize that we may be on the verge of the next revolution in transportation technology--namely, the substitution of electronic communication for the physical movement of people. What are its implications for urban transportation?

What conclusions can we draw about urban transportation needs? Reading all of the answers to the questions posed above leaves the general impression that public transportation is being downgraded and the automobile exalted yet again. To a degree this is intentional. The aim has been to place the considerable public support which has developed in the seventies for the concept of public transportation on a more realistic footing. Public transportation is unlikely to achieve many of the things people hope for from it. But that is not to deny a real need for improved public transportation. It is the only alternative to peak-hour congestion; it is the only way mobility can be provided for the elderly and handicapped. At the same time, it is unlikely to reduce highway congestion; air pollution and energy consumption are perhaps better attacked directly at their source by modifying the automobile; and we should not expect public transportation to solve our social problems of poverty and inner city decay.

NEIGHBORHOODS: THEIR EVOLVING ROLE IN URBAN POLICY

by

Kerry D. Vandell, Ph.D.

Southern Methodist University

The concept of "neighborhood" has been understood at least informally even prior to the urbanization of human society. However, it has come to take on a more significant meaning and role in our post-industrial urban society. Traditionally it has been associated with residential areas and has come to represent some measure of homogeneity within a contiguous geographic area.* To sociologists and anthropoligists "neighborhood" has come to mean an area of similar social class and possibly religion, ethnicity, and occupation within which there exists a high degree of household interaction. To economists it is an area of similar incomes and "tastes" with housing units in similar price ranges which fluctuate together. To architects it represents an area of similar housing stock design and age. The exact delineation of neighborhood boundaries is often elusive, if not impossible, since each of the measures above may yield different results or may be so inexact as to be inconclusive.

In spite of the problems in defining and delineating neighborhoods, however, there has long been general agreement that neighborhoods and "neighborhoodedness" (the perception of community or belonging to a neighborhood) often has a major impact on the way in which values and attitudes are generated and passed down in urban society and on the way in which the real estate market behaves over time. Earlier studies of neighborhoods viewed these phenomena in descriptive terms. However, in the last 20 years or so there has developed a realization that neighborhoods can potentially serve as a base for an active policy tool in which the relationship between "neighborhoodedness," values, and real estate market conditions can be exploited to yield certain desirable social and economic benefits. Thus, neighborhood-based health clinics, recreation centers, security forces, drug rehabilitation programs, and housing subsidy programs, have been developed to complement the more traditional neighborhood schools, churches, and community centers.

---

*More recently "neighborhods" have become associated with nonresidential uses also. In addition, "homogeneity" is no longer always considered a component of the definition of neighborhood; some residential neighborhoods are actually characterized by their diversity.

A necessary prerequisite to the use of the neighborhood concept as an active tool of public policy in all of the above instances is the development of a strong feeling of belonging and attachment rather than the feeling of detachment and impersonal apathy which has come to characterize so many suburban and inner-city neighborhoods. Subsequently, a number of public policy efforts have been designed to encourage such "neighborhoodedness." For example, one major cornerstone of the Carter Administration's Urban Policy is the directing of resources directly to neighborhood groups and the formation of an Office of Neighborhoods within HUD. In addition, a number of private nonprofit organizations have begun to encourage formation of city-wide association of neighborhood-based organizations which can deal with issues of common interest at a "grass roots" level. The following discussion outlines four of these issues--neighborhood decline and abandonment, redlining, neighborhood revitalization, and housing of special needs populations--which have been clearly identified as issues relevant to neighborhood-based approaches to dealing with them.

Neighborhood Decline and Abandoment

Over the last decade many older inner-city neighborhoods have painfully experienced the adverse consequences of rampant decline and abandonment. Such decline has been a contributing factor to numerous social and physical pathologies associated with the inner-city--including increasing crime and vandalism, fires and arson, vermin, deterioration of social relationships, declining property values and tax base, and increasing service costs. As such, it has been the object of public policy efforts designed to understand its causes and to seek points of intervention which could halt or reverse it.

Neighborhood decline has come to be recognized as a dynamic process and not a static state, with abandonment its final stage. In its less virulent form, this process--often described as "downward filtering"--is quite common, and a tendency that accompanies the aging of the housing stock and a turnover in the population. No single factor has been identified as the dominant precipitator of decline. Generally, depending on the neighborhood, a number of factors, acting either on the demand or supply side of the housing market, interact to begin the process. On the demand side these factors include, among others, the quality of service provision (including schools), income changes in the neighborhood, changes in the stage in life cycle of neighborhood residents, and a decline in the feeling of "community" and the strength of the local neighborhood organization. On the supply side, a few of the factors which have been identified are changes in operating and maintenance costs, "redlining" (the elimination of mortgage credit availability for certain neighborhoods), changes in property tax rates, rezoning to destroy the residential homogeneity of an area, and a supply of new housing alternatives on the suburban fringe made accessible by limited access expressways.

Since there is usually not a single cause of decline, no single "cure" is usually available. Policy responses must, however, be appropriate to the particular conditions generating decline. They range from the upgrading of schools, the rejuvenation of neighborhood organizations and code enforcement to mortgage and rehabilitation subsidy programs, tax reform, and suburban building moratoria. A comprehensive, yet locally flexible program, whether it be administered at the municipal, state, or federal level is the only hope of combatting neighborhood decline. In all cases, the active participation of neighborhood residents and organizations is a necessary prerequisite to any policy response.

Redlining

"Redlining"--the practice by mortgage lenders of withdrawing credit availability from an entire neighborhood because of its supposed "riskiness"--in recent years has become an object of serious policy debate. Community groups contend such wholesale exclusion from credit unfairly penalizes many good risks, is often not based on a true assessment of default risk but rather on lenders preconceptions, and often actually precipitates neighborhood decline by locking individuals into their properties and preventing them from acquiring the capital to maintain them. In other words, redlining acts as a "self fulfilling prophecy" of decline. Lenders, on the other hand, maintain either that redlining *per se* does not go on--that every loan application is reviewed on its own merits--or that the risks associated with properties in "redlined" areas are very real, that their lending policies in these areas are responses to, rather than causes of decline, and that demand for properties in older inner-city areas is actually very low, resulting in an "appearance" of redlining.

It is not proper to quickly attach villainous labels to the various actors affecting the redlining in process, nor is it proper to apply simple prescriptive solutions to the problem, for, just as with most urban phenomena, redlining is complex and its form varies from neighborhood to neighborhood and over time. Four primary hypothesis have been advanced to explain its existence: (a) a "prisoners' dilemma" hypothesis in which one lender would take a major loss if he alone decided to lend in the redlined area; (b) a "lack of information" hypotheses in which lenders have very little knowledge of inner-city housing markets and are unwilling to use resources to develop such knowledge in lieu of profitable suburban lending opportunities; (c) a "wrong information" hypothesis in which lenders are being provided with market information which is incorrect, biased, or speculative; and (d) a "discrimination" hypothesis which explains lender behavior through racial or class discrimination.

Elements of each of the above conditions are probably present in all "redlined" neighborhoods. However, different factors may dominate in different areas. Since certain policies are effective only against certain conditions, this implies the need for a comprehensive policy program, yet one which allows special emphasis in different neighborhoods. Policies which have been proposed and applied range from risk-pooling associations of lenders and loan insurance, guarantee, or subsidy programs to the development of activist civil rights and anti-redlining regulations. The active participation of community groups and neighborhood residents in a partnership with lenders and municipal governments is necessary to effectively direct resources toward combatting the problem of redlining.

Neighborhood Revitalization

The 1970's have been a period of regeneration for a number of older close-in neighborhoods in the nation's cities. Usually initiated by private market forces rather than through government encouragement and support, this revitalization process has been reinforced by the decisions of a number of middle and upper-middle income households to opt for the city rather than the suburban environs, as had been customary in the past. The forces behind such dynamics are several: increasing costs of gasoline, highway congestion, a reawakening of interest in older architectural styles, a desire to be close to the social and cultural activity of the central city, a desire for a more heterogeneous living environment, and the increasing cost of new housing among others. Many of the new city dwellers are young (under 40) and are often childless and thus without a great deal of concern over school quality.

Thus far, the "back to the city" movement--although significant in its impact in some areas--has been quite localized, primarily in a few neighborhoods of unusual architectural or historical significance. Furthermore, the extent to which neighborhoods of lesser significance can be "spontaneously"upgraded is unknown. The number of "urban pioneers" has not yet been firmly established, although one estimate places it at a miniscule fraction of those households opting for the suburbs and warns the available pool of such households will be much smaller in the future as households age and children reach school age. Thus the potential for further such revitalization is uncertain.

Several appropriate policy questions emerge which relate to the issue of neighborhood revitalization:

-To the extent that revitalization involves replacing a lower income population with a higher-income one, any successful revitalization program creates a displacement problem. How can this best be dealt with?

-To the extent that revitalization is a desirable response to the problems associated with decline, what can the government do to hasten it where it is currently occurring, to spread it to more marginal neighborhoods, and to foster a demand for city living among more households? Policy options which have been recommended range from stricter zoning controls, historic district designations, intensified service provision, and tax incentives to subsidized rehabilitation loan programs and limitations on highway and new home construction.

- To what extent do government efforts in support of revitalization displace private sector resources which would have gone into an area anyway? To what extent do they supplement the private sector? To what extent do they encourage additional private sector funding?
- How can the private sector participate? Can they effect locational decisions, make available the necessary financing, both directly and through risk pooling arrangements, and carry out the necessary rehabilitation?
- How can local residents compel a neighborhood's upgrading? Can they develop strong neighborhood organizations to push for higher service levels, more desirable zoning, and increased financial support and to monitor the area's physical condition?

Any successful effort at revitalization of large numbers of inner-city neighborhoods must ultimately be a partnership between the government, the residents, and the private sector. This is supported by the fact that the Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS) program and all similar successful efforts to focus resources for the stabilization or revitalization of less significant lower-middle income neighborhoods have been based upon such a partnership arrangement where the neighborhood played a major role.

Housing of Special Needs Populations

The production and encouragement of housing for households with "special needs"--the poor, the elderly, the handicapped--over the last 30 years has become an accepted policy objective of the federal government. This is a natural outgrowth of the national goal of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family" enunciated in the Housing Act of 1949. The earliest activity actually came prior to 1949--in 1937 when the Wagner-Steagall Act creating the public housing program was passed. However, the aim of the program at that time was to house the "temporarily" poor victims of the Depression rather than special needs groups. It was not until after the Second World War that the public housing tenantry shifted toward the "chronic" poor. At first confined to poor families regardless of age, by the mid-1950's and through the early 1960's special provisions were made to house the elderly poor. More recent legislation has also required attention to provisions for the handicapped in government housing and other public and private facilities.

The objectives associated with the provision of housing for special needs groups seem simple at first--to provide for the needs of the tenant population in a cost-effective manner. However, accomplishment of these objectives has proved difficult. The physical and social problems of public housing have been well documented: high-density drab structures, lack of security provisions, and unsuitable locations. However, a number of additional non-physical problems also exist and may be even more serious: low rent ceilings which constrain revenues, income limits and other admissions criteria which encourage non-upward mobility, high per-unit costs of productions and maintenance, tenant selection procedures which are often inequitable and arbitrary, high overhead costs, and negative effects upon the surrounding neighborhood. Housing for the elderly and handicapped enjoys relatively few problems compared to traditional public housing, and as a result it enjoys much greater popularity with the public. Not only are the elderly and handicapped considered by the public a more "deserving" poor, the provision of such housing frees children from the necessity of caring for elderly and handicapped parents in the home.

In all of the above cases a very similar set of planning and policy issues must be addressed which have not always been successfully responded to in the past: location must be near services demanded by tenants and near public transportation, tenants must be made secure from threats of crime and violence, common meeting areas should be provided, the social as well as the physical needs of the tenants must be considered, the units must be quiet and easily maintainable, and tenants must be allowed to pursue as much of their desired lifestyle as possible. In short, there must be a realization that special needs populations require the same amenities and relationships created by a neighborhood as other households do. The objective of public policy efforts must therefore, be to foster the development of such a neighborhood environment.

Conclusions

In each of the above sets of issues it is evident that neighborhood organizations and a feeling of attachment to the local community are important components in any prescriptive policy effort. As the relationship between neighborhoods and urban policy gradually is recognized by governments, similar programs will evolve in other areas which will continue to contribute to the achievement of the ideal of a truly participatory democratic system.

SUGGESTED READINGS

1. Aaron, Henry J. *Shelter and Subsidies*, Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1972.
2. Black, J. Thomas. "Private Market Housing Renovation in Central Cities: A ULI Survey," *Urban Land*.
3. Devine, Richard J.; Rennie, Winston O.; Simms, Brenda N. *Where the Lender Looks First: A Case Study of Mortgage Disinvestment in Bronx County*, 1960-1970. New York: National Urban League, 1973.
4. Friedman, Lawrence M. "Public Housing and the Poor," in Jon Pynoos, et al, Housing Urban America, Chicago: Aldine, 1973.
5. Lynch, Dudley. "New Life for Old Neighborhoods," *D Magazine*, July 1974, pp. 18ff.
6. Solomon, Arthur P. *Housing the Urban Poor*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1974.
7. Stanfield, Rochelle L. "Cities Being Rehabilitated, though Housing Ills Remain," *National Journal*, July 17, 1976, pp. 1004-1009.
8. Stegman, Michael. *Housing Investment in the Inner City: The Dynamics of Decline*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1972.
9. Sternlieb, George and Burchell, Robert W. *Residential Abandonment: The Tenement Landlord Revisited*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Center for Urban Policy Research, 1973.
10. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Mortgage Money: Who Gets It?* Clearinghouse Publication No. 48, June 1974.
11. U.S. Congress, Senate, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Committee on Banking and Currency, "Financial Institutions and the Urban Crisis," 90th Congress, 2nd Session, Sept., 1968.
12. Vandell, Kerry; Hodis, Barbara; Bratt, Rachel. *The Effects of Financial Institutions on Neighborhood Decline; A Review of the Literature*. Washington, D.C.: Federal Home Loan Bank Board, November, 1974.

YOUTH: A HUMANISTIC PERSPECTIVE

by

Harvey Graff, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Dallas

Introduction

Concern about youth--the 'young of today,' the citizens of tomorrow,' the 'future of society'--is linked closely to a surprisingly wide range of social issues and public policy questions. Discussions about employment, legal rights and status, crime and punishment, career choice and preparation, political responsibilities, and, of course, education, seldom proceed very far without some mention made of their relatioship to that part of the population which we rather imprecisely call 'youth' of 'the young.' Usually, much more than mention is made! In fact, the number of important and critical issues whose understanding and solution touches upon the place of youth, expectations for and of youth, and our hopes and fears for the young is much larger than the examples listed here might suggest. This is one reason why we hear so often today--as indeed virtually all past generations have heard--that the young are irresponsible, neglectful, unappreciative, untrained or untrainable, undisciplined, and/or actually delinquent--in other words, today's youth, we repeatedly perceive, are not measuring up to some articulated standards we set for them.

If we accept the centrality of youth to so many important and current social issues, then we must agree that clarity and perspective are desperately required in our confrontations with the problems and our struggles at their solution. One path to these needed ends derives from considering youth in broader social and institutional contexts: in seeking clearer understanding through greater attention to the concepts of youth by which we perceive and evaluate their actions and behavior, the various kinds of social relationships in which youth engage, and the contradictions between the roles and responsibilities we expect the young to fulfill and the limited rights we extend to them. Shifting our perspectives from issues of the moment, alone, we can develop alternative ways in which to seek understanding and to develop policies, by developing better and broader contexts in which to view the major issues and their relevance of youth to them.

Definitions of Youth

Definitions claim our attention first. Indeed, it may not be too simplistic to consider that many of society's difficulties with the young derive rather directly from two factors: 1) the ways in which we define the time, experience, and quality of adolescence, and the expectations we hold about them; and 2) the confusion over underlying definitions of youth.

Two kinds of definitions dominate public discussions. The first is the more simple; we define youth and adolescence by chronology, roughly from ages 12 to about 18 or 19; sometimes we extend it into the 20's. The second sort of definition is rather closely related to the first: definition by social arrangements; for example, time in school, time with peer groups, lack of work, period of irresponsibility, and so on. These definitions, we may conclude, define not by concept or goals, but rather by description of historically-developed, economically and socially-framed factors. Nonetheless, while they might serve accurately as descriptions, they may also have produced many of youth's problematic characterists.

If we take other definitions of youth, this problem may be more clearly illustrated, especially in so far as present-day "solutions" do not come very close to meeting the needs of the young themselves or to achieving society's goals for those in the period of youth. Adolescence is a period of transition from childhood and its rather complete dependency, to adulthood with its more (or at least relatively) complete independence. Youth should be characterized by a transition to more independence and increasing rights and responsibilities. Youth should then increasingly be a more important and more central part of the society to which they belong and the community in which they live--a time for integration, responsibility, and involvement. As well, youth can be a period of rapid and interelated changes: sexual ones of puberty, physiological growth and development, and psychological confusion. They manifest themselves in a search for self and identity, quest for autonomy, experimentation with different roles and goals, search for moral understanding, development of sociability and modes of interaction, especially with the other sex and with other age groupings. There is, in addition, an important level of conflict and tension: between self and society, ambivalence about many things, estrangement and isolation, wariness and distrust - along with the opposite feelings for each of these aspects. Hope and fears dominate the experience.

Traditionally, societies integrated youth with adult society, aiding these difficult rites of passage by their social, economic, and institutional arrangements. How well do modern societies fare in assisting youth? By isolating them and increasing and extending time and quality of dependency, modern advanced societies undoubtedly exacerbate the very real travails of youth. The first issue, therefore, must focus on the relationship between definitions and the expectations they encompass, and the actual experience and needs of "growing up" and maturing. For example, by studying the intrinsic characteristics of adolescence and youth, we may evaluate how well and how poorly policies and institions serve the interests of youth themselves, as well as those of the community.

The Origins of Our Concept of Youth

The roots of this problem lie in the historical past, although we seldom see this. As a result, in both academic and popular circles, there exists a great deal of confusion about what is meant by "youth" or adolescence." This confusion underlies, in fact, much of the current difficulty in understanding and in planning relevant and appropriate programs for those aged, approximately, 12-19 (or sometimes, 12-25). Some of this confusion relates to the erroneous idea that something like a life-cycle stage of youth and adolescence did not exist in the U.S. before the late 19th or even the early 20th century. It is important to note, in understanding the meaning of this stage of life and its social, psychological, economic, cultural, and educational concommitants, that youth, as a defined life stage, and its problems, existed in virtually all times and cultures. Adolescence, as a critical transition phase--between childhood and adulthood--is a universal feature of maturing and "growing up:" as a time of puberty, physical maturity, and rapid physical growth; as a time of skill learning, self-seeking, identity development; and as a search for autonomy. What differs, and critically so, is the way in which these universal elements are mediated and interpreted by different societies and cultures.

Thus, it is very wrong to think that "problems" of youth come only with advanced urbanization and industrial development, as we have so often. Youth as a life stage did change in important ways in this setting; it is these changes which are important for us to consider in evaluation of policy options with regard to juveniles.

In important ways, the problems of youth which confront society and its public agencies and institutions so severely today are results of the "invention" of a new kind of "Adolescence," a social creation of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. In this period, families increasingly shut themselves away from public and community affairs, homes became "refuges", closer bonds between parents and offspring were encouraged and developed, and dependency of the young upon others increased. As there increasingly was less demand for child and juvenile labor (a complicated development in itself), special institutions and activities were created, ranging from the high school to clubs, peer groups, scouting, and the like.

These developments led to the origins of the modern segregation of youth from adults, children, responsibilities, and remunerative forms of work. Education and other organized activities came to take more and more of their time, creating a new age-bonding for a group that previously and traditionally had been given wider responsibilities and meaningful status. While taking away most status from the young, these changes resulted in the basis for many of the social problems of youth today. The main distinctions that remain are those of social class and race, which continue to separate one youth from another; youth who are otherwise locked together, expected to develop somehow at the same rate and pace, presented with a series of fundamentally contradictory alternatives, expected to have the same needs and goals. It is little wonder that youth has become a "problem"!

The Rights of Youth

In this context it is not too surprising that the young today, we are led to believe and are told incessantly, are spoiled and privileged; too much is simply given to them, and they learn to expect it forever more. Actual facts do not bear out this often repeated viewpoint; for, in reality, the young, essentially those under the statutory age of 18 years, have virtually no rights under the law, few guarantees of constitutional provisions, and precious little recourse through courts, councils, or legislatures. And, when legal agencies and concerned citizens attempt to "protect" the young as in the use of "juvenile" justice institutions or "status offender" programs, the contradictions and complications are more often increased than clarified. Indeed, the very concept of an individual offending against his or her "status," which developed in the effort to reduce the consequences of juvenile criminal convictions for the young, illustrates the confusion and continuing lack of solutions to the difficult but very real positions of youth.

To an incredible degree, institutions, states, courts, and parents have a power embodied in statutes and codes which makes the opinion of the spoils of overprivileged youth a very sad and misplaced jest. The dependency of youth on these and other social agencies, when laws are enforced, is near complete. Of course, we do not often see this reality in action; it is the lower class and racial minorities (those without protection and barriers of comfort between themselves and the agencies of enforcement) that know about their powerlessness and consequently respond with fear and hostility, creating vicious and destructive cycles.

We are forced to ask, to what degree does this dependency and lack of civil human rights serve to protect the young, as it developed historically with genuine humanitarian intentions of removing juveniles from the structures and punishments designed for adult offenders and deviants? Conversely, to what degree does this denial of rights, and correspondingly, the denial of responsibilities, serve to further juvenile misbehavior, lack of descipline, crime and offenses. It is in fact quite possible and reasonable to claim, as students of the problem increasingly do, that the lack of rights makes more problems and complications than it solves. More and more make this case in great detail with a depressingly large amount of documentation.

Youth have virtually no rights; decisions for them are in hands of families which may or may not act in the best interests of youth themselves and society; too much depends on the social class position and resources of the parents. Yet, it is not quite accurate to leave the issues at the parental level alone, for parents and families are simultaneously bolstered and contradicted by civil and criminal codes and a wide variety of social agencies whose goals and resources have proved woefully unsuited to the task assigned to them. The aforementioned plight of "status offenders" is just one poignant example.

Development of realistic rights, embodied in law and social institutions, might provide a more economical, effective, and efficient way of meeting contemporary problems of juveniles. It surely cannot function to do a less effective job of socializing the young than present arrangements do. We expect youth to mature into adult roles and to assume the rights and responsibilities of adulthood and citizenship; we also expect them to be responsible while young. Are these expectations fair ones to embrace if we do not grant realistic and important roles, responsibilities, and rights to the young as they grow up?

Youth and Education

It is difficult for anyone today, perhaps, to think about those we call youth or adolescents without thinking almost at once of schools and high schools. We might even consider that this age group is virtually defined, for most of its existence, by it relationship with that institution.

Under the twin brunt of compulsory schooling laws (usually to age 16, if not 17 or 18) and child labor laws, we allow those aged from about 12-19 very few other places in society. With the extension of mass education to junior or community colleges and even further, the stage earmarked by a lack of responsibility, remunerative and self-supporting work, and some important extent of independence, has been prolonged greatly.

In the schools, we develop in youth a series of contradictory expectations and demands. They are told that they are being prepared for life and work, but does the curriculum and the way in which it is presented to them really do this? Is it in fact meant to do so? They are told to be upright and responsible, but they are treated more like children than as near adults and maturing individuals. Little meaningful responsibility is given to them to be practiced or shared in; consequently, they are told constantly that they are irresponsible. They are told as well that they are being prepared for real integration into society, but they remain segregated from those younger and older, kept from most forms of work and employment, and segregated into age groups with peers who may in fact differ from each other as much as they share hopes, goals, capacities, achievements, backgrounds, and even degrees of maturity ad psycho-physiological development. Schooling is not presented as an alternative to the young; it has become a matter of fact. Consequently, many respond to it as they might to a prison (which entirely too many highly resemble, both inside and out). It is difficult to recognize this period as the "best time of their lives", as they are so often told.

The parameters of high school have expanded rapidly in this century, with no sign of abating or narrowing. School has taken over much that was formerly an issue for the family, the church, or the community, as well as for employers or apprenticeship training programs. This produces a high level of potential conflict, too often unstated, which surrounds youth with hostile agencies and institutions. Youth in school are presented with contradictions, few options, heavy expectations, and constant pressure. The only way which our artificially created and socially-imposed homogeneity and segregation is differentiated is by social class and race. Both attitudes toward youth and the realities of inequality, streaming, and generational "reproduction" of the social structure are shaped in important ways in this period. Attitudes from home, testing and tracking, demeaning and woefully incomplete "vocational" preparation, along with income and wealth variation insure that full opportunities and real social integration do not take place in the school--the institution in which youth are to spend most of their time, either curricularly or in extracurricular activities. Schooling and training, we might consider, need not take this form or have their contemporary consequences.

Youth and Work

When we think of youth, especially those aged 12 to 18 and still in school, one of the last topics that come to mind is work, unless it is some modicum of part-time work, to give them "responsibility" or to earn spending money or some sort of work-study, quasi-vocational program. Work and adolescence, if we refer to fulltime, meaningful, remunerative, and skilled labor, have become near polar opposities in modern industrial society.

Of course, it was not always this way (and by extension we ought to ask if it is best to remain this way). In past times, young people began working, working long hours and fulltime, by age 12 to 14; on the job they helped to support their families and they learned experientially the ways of the work world and the skills of their trade or business. In fact, for children of all groups, classes, and races (excepting young women largely), this was the normative transitional period to adulthood.

This began to change in the last part of the 19th century and continued in the present century. Many forces were at work, mixed motives of both positive and negative kinds. These ranged from humanitarian efforts to prevent the exploitation of the young by parents and employers, labor unions' efforts to remove the cheap competition of the young and the depressing results on wage rates, and efforts of school reformers to build up a clientele for high schools and to garner the young in the school for socialization, habit and attitude formation, and installation of proper social morality and work discipline.

The results are very much with us today; they also are mixed. By "protecting" the young, what consequences have been obtained? The young increasingly are segregated from other ages and other aspects of society; they are denied responsibility and meaningful-rewarding training experiences; they are kept in school despite increasing evidence that school may not be the best place for all of them. They are socialized to become social problems, and hardly surprisingly they become by definition and by behavior just that.

Alternatives may exist. The problems of juvenile delinquency, discipline and motivation in school, the institutional and chronological segregation of adolescents might be more usefully considered, if not so easily solved, by the development of new policies aimed at removing the structural dependency and homogenization of the young and replacing them with real alternatives which have different forms of work at their core. Schooling and work can be mixed or alternated. Real needs exist for young workers--in services, and in a wide variety of institutions. Such options must allow the allocation of responsibilities, rights, and practical socially beneficial training to the young, without exploiting them. We need not repeat the errors and excesses of the past in order to learn from its lessons.

Conclusions

No answers or guaranteed solutions have been presented in this brief perspective on youth, its roles, responsibilities, and rights (or, perhaps we should say, its lack of them); none were promised. Rather, we must conclude that alternative--and very useful--perspectives on the place and problems of youth are possible. These perspectives, only a sample of which have been presented here, are important; they can lead us first to new questions the very asking of which may lead us to new answers and to new ways of dealing with persisting problems. The issues, of course, remain difficult; no important social issues can be resolved easily. Nevertheless, this kind of hard thinking and serious, critical questioning is required if we genuinely desire to escape the limits of the present and to establish the new contexts required for confronting such major issues and policy problems as those of youth--problems which, as we noted at the onset of this discussion, touch upon so many of our most pressing concerns today. The process for which I plead now is a humanistic one. This represents an effort to reflect critically and deeply about very basic, continuing issues of social and public policy in different ways. Towards this path, we may call upon the contributions of historical understanding, value clarification, alternative-searching, new ways of phrasing the issues and new ways of posing old questions. Such an attempt is undoubtedly difficult; only if we seriously want to meet better the needs of our society, ourselves, and our children will we take the hard steps required to test this perspective. Have we any real choice...?

SUGGESTED READINGS

1. Adams, Paul, et al., Children's Rights. New York: Praeger, 1971.
2. Bowles, S. & Grintage, H. Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books, 1976.
3. Coleman, James, ed. Youth: Transition to Adulthood. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1974.
4. Davis, Natalie Z. "The Reasons of Misrule: Youth Groups & Charivaris," Past & Present, 50 (1971), 41-75.
5. Erikson, Eric, ed. The Challenge of Youth. Garden City: Anchor, 1965.
6. Friedenberg, E.3. Coming of Age in America. New York: Vintage, 1965.
7. Gillis, John. Youth & History. New York: Academic Press, 1974.
8. Goodman, Paul. Growing Up Absurd. New York: Vintage, 1960.
9. Gotlieb, David, ed. Children's Liberation. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1973.
10. Grass, R. & B., eds. The Children's Rights Movement. Garden City: Anchor, 1977.
11. Katz, M. B. The People of Hamilton, Canada West. Cambridge: Harvard U.P., 1975. Chapter 5.
12. Kennistan, Kenneth. Youth and Dissent. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanich, 1971.
13. Kett, Joseph. Rites of Passage. New York: Basic Books, 1977.
14. Krug, Edward. The American High School, 2 vols. New York: Harper & Row, 1964; Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1972.
15. Libarle, Marc & Seligman, Tam, eds. The High School Revolutionaries. New York: Vintage, 1970.

NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION AND DISPLACEMENT:

SOME NEGLECTED CONSIDERATIONS

by

Peter J. Leahy, Ph.D.

Southern Methodist University

INTRODUCTION

Displacement can be defined quite simply as the physical removal of people from a neighborhood or place of residence. As a society our concern with the effects of displacement was first dramatized in the massive urban renewal programs underwritten by the federal government in the 1950's and 1960's. It was in these programs that local government displaced thousands of citizens and restructured the shape of inner city life. As public officials and private citizens grew increasingly aware of the negative consequences of displacing large numbers of people, the demand for urban renewal waned by the end of the 1960 decade. The fact that urban renewal was disproportionately exercised on the black and the poor also weakened its legitimacy in the eyes of many. Not unrelated, to be sure, was the fact that urban renewal hadn't delivered the resurgence of downtown and the inner city that it had promised.

Displacement as an issue again appears to be high on the public agenda as of this writing (April 1979). Today, however, while a variety of public programs still contribute to it, the primary displacement activity has been caused by the private sector. This has occurred primarily through the process of neighborhood revitalization which has received extensive publicity in recent years nationwide as well as in Dallas. It is apparent that the private sector has had some success in stemming metropolitan decentralization tendencies as evidenced by the increase of neighborhood revitalization projects in inner cities and the attraction of what have been referred to as "urban pioneers" to inner city neighborhoods.

Accompanying revitalization has been the less-well-publicized problem of displacement. The true extent of the displacement problem, however, is presently unknown to any level of government. No public or private agenda has to this date been successful in monitoring the different revitalization activities which have been contributing to the dislocation of people. Nevertheless, the emergence of a number of negative effects associated with the displacement caused by neighborhood revitalization indicates that public officials, private investors, and neighborhood citizens all must take a more careful look into what is happening.

Since the benefits of neighborhood revitalization (e.g., increase in taxes) are generally over represented in most contemporary accountings of the phenomenon, this paper will specifically address the negative effects that accompany revitalization. Thus, the paper is an attempt to ring balance to an issue which has been previously treated in a rather one-sided fashion. Specifically, it will assess the impact of displacement upon both citizens and the city as a whole, and present policy alternatives that have been advanced elsewhere. Although the evidence is still incomplete, I will rely on the available literature to address the following four questions in the pages that follow.

> What are the stages of neighborhood revitalization that produce displacement?
>
> Who are the so-called "urban pioneers" who are involved in the displacement processes?
>
> Who are the displaced and what are the consequences of displacement for these people?
>
> What policy options have been advocated for addressing the problem?

STAGES OF NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION:

The National Urban Coalition has identified four phases which appear to occur in private market rehabilitation of older neighborhoods. It will be instructive to examine them here for each has a particular relationship to displacement.

Phase 1 - The Start-Up Phase

The first group of investors (owner-occupants) is attracted to the neighborhood. The rate and scale of rehabilitation is small and work may be centered around only a few blocks. Pioneers in this stage generally cite the diversity of neighborhood life and the low cost of housing as the attractions. Generally, very little displacement accompanies this stage, and the displacement which does occur tends to be voluntary.

Phase 2 - The Buy-In Phase

Rehabilitation activity spreads to surrounding neighborhood areas and increases steadily. Confidence in the investment value of the neighborhood grows and people buy in. Displacement begins to accelerate during this period.

Phase 3 - The Take-Off Phase

As the number of people who have "bought in" reaches a certain level, the neighborhood is widely acknowledged to be "a good investment" and "a good place to live". Confidence in the neighborhood's future is established. People attracted to the neighborhood at this time seek more security and status than previous groups. Speculative activity increases dramatically. The rehabilitation of the entire area now seems inevitable. The maximum displacement impact occurs during this phase.

Phase 4 - The Fill-In Phase

The few properties which remain unimproved are bought and improved. Property values of both renovated and unrenovated buildings have risen dramatically to reflect the established investment value of the neighborhood.

Property tax assessments reflect the increased valuation. Pre-revitalization homeowners are susceptible to these changes and their displacement is most likely late in the take-off phase and during this period.

There is some evidence to suggest that the "first pioneers" in Phase 1 are subsequently displaced by the "latter-day pioneers" in Phases 3 and 4. Most likely this reflects subsequent profit-taking on the part of the first group of investors, and also the fact (see below) that many are young professionals whose lifestyle in the early stages of a career is characterized by high mobility.

Thus, from a rather inconspicuous beginning, existing neighborhood residents are subject to increasing residential pressures in their communities which become defined as "attractive places to live" and "sound investment opportunities." Let's look now at the characteristics of the so-called "pioneers" who are involved in the revitalization process. This is important because they are generally quite unlike those persons already living in the neighborhood.

WHO ARE THE "URBAN PIONEERS": A PROFILE OF THE NEIGHBORHHOD REVITALIZERS

The great majority of all urban reinvestment has taken place in areas close to downtown. Dallas is no exception to this trend. In addition revitalization sometimes has developed around desirable institutional locations, such as universities.

From a variety of reports from numerous cities it is clear that the urban pioneer to these areas does have a readily indentifiable profile. First, he tends to have a much higher income level than existing neighborhood residents. He is a professional and white collar worker moving into neighborhoods populated by blue collar workers and the unemployed. Contrary to a popular contemporary view, not all of the pioneers are single or childless. In fact, most recent studies demonstrated that couples with children are as frequent as singles or couples without children. Their children, however, are more likely to go to private or parochial schools than are the children of existing residents.

The pioneer is rather young, with a median age generally in the early 30's. He tends to be a homeowner. Since neighborhood revitalization generally takes place in the older urban areas which had previously suffered economic decline, this means that the pioneer is interested in reconverting rental structures back into single-family homes. Thus his interests clash with those of the large proportion of renters who generally reside in these neighborhoods. Finally, but no less significant, the pioneer is generally white, while the typical displaced person tends to be a minority group member.

The reasons why people are being attracted back into inner-city neighborhoods are clearly varied. Nevertheless, some common motivations can be identified across the country. These include:

> Proximity to employment (many of the young professional pioneers work downtown).
>
> The desire for more space -- older homes often are larger and more roomy, once revitalized.
>
> The desire to live in older neighborhoods because of their alternative to contemporary mass-produced housing, or because of the perceived historical significance of the neighborhood.
>
> The availability of public transportation, particularly for the commute to work. This may reflect attitudinal changes introduced by the energy crisis.
>
> Cheaper cost of housing. This is a rationale primarily given by pioneers who enter a neighborhood in Phase 1 or in Phase 2.
>
> The desire to live near cultural events - generally located downtown.

The pioneer's social background and socio-economic status level contrast quite sharply with that of the displaced. Let us turn now to a consideration of the people who are being displaced by neighborhood revitalization.

WHO ARE THE DISPLACED?

The evidence about the consequences of displacement caused by neighborhood revitalization is fragmentary because these people have been virtually invisible statistically to date. As a society we know a little about who they are; less about where they go; and even less about the consequences of the displacement that they bear. The following discussion summarizes the state of our contemporary knowledge.

We find that all studies are in agreement that the elderly, minorities (especially Blacks and Mexican-Americans) and the poor and working class (including Whites) are the principal victims of neighborhood revitalization. While all of these groups can be characterized as among the least politically influential in America, it is upon the elderly, perhaps the least influential of all, that displacement has fallen most heavily. The displaced, then, include low-and moderate-income homeowners who are pressured by realty brokers to sell only to find that their housing options are limited elsewhere; fixed-income elderly tenants who have enjoyed low rents for years and suddenly have nowhere to go because their units have been purchased for luxury rehabilitation; and large low-income minority families who find the public or private ability to place them in housing to be lacking.

These people tend to feel displacement pressure in three major ways. First, pressure can be exerted by realtors who try to convince homeowners to sell early in the revitalization process and who contribute to speculation. Secondly, rising tax assessments, as noted previously, force many homeowners to sell at a later stage in the revitalization process. Finally increased code enforcement activity adds increased financial pressure to pre-revitalization residents.

As these three sources drive up costs for the homeowner, so too do the costs for renters rise as well. In fact, tenants generally face even fewer options than owners, as rents are raised to reflect the market and leases are terminated to attract more prosperous clients.

There is strikingly little contemporary evidence about the various consequences of revitalization displacement activity upon people. However, until more research becomes available we can rely upon evidence gathered from two related sources as a reasonable guide: first, the experience of displacement in urban renewal programs and second, the effects of relocating aged individuals. In general these seem to be three well-documented effects visible from these experiences.

> The dislocated prefer to remain as close as possible to their former place of residence if housing is available. This reflects either an attachment to the former community or a lack of choice in finding alternative housing. A number of present research projects are attempting to clarify this relationship.
>
> The urban renewal experience has documented that dislocation causes serious economic and financial loss to individuals in the form of higher rents after displacement and increased transportation costs to work.
>
> Urban renewal and studies of aged relocation have also documented the very severe social psychological costs which dislocated people bear. This appears to be the most serious consequence of displacement activity. These costs include the destruction of long-established and highly meaningful community ties. (Community is such a fragile construction that its loss is also of serious concern to the city as a whole.) The severance of established ties is particularly acute for the aged who have resided in their community for a considerable period of time.

From studies dealing with the dislocation of aged persons, we can identify the following hypotheses as being plausible in the context of the social-psychological costs of the displacement discusses in this paper.

> The less the choice a person has over whether to move, as well as the less the choice in where to move, the more severe the social psychological consequences of the displacement.
>
> The less prepared an individual is for his/her new environment (i.e., the less it resembles the previous one; the less informed the person is about it), the more severe the psychological consequences of displacement.

> Persons who are used to controlling their own destiny and fate are particularly harmed by displacement since they feel they have so little control over this episode in their lives. The more attached the person is to his/her former neighborhood, all other things being equal, the more severe the consequences of the displacement.

It should be made clear that social psychological effects can range from a "sense of loss" at being transplanted on the one hand to a shortened life span on the other. That is, some studies have demonstrated that forced relocation of aged residents has been associated with a shorter life span. This is clearly a potential effect that well-meaning individuals should wish to prevent in their communities.

The obvious most immediate need at the present time is for precise documentation of the displacement process. This, of course, may pose a dilemma for city officials who are overjoyed that a return-to-the-city movement has rekindled investment in the center city. Yet, it is imperative that a city consider both sides of the redevelopment coin. It seems to me that there are two basic arguments for its doing so. First, city officials are sworn to uphold the Public Interest. This goal of government is being subverted if a substantial number of citizens are being displaced by neighborhood revitalization efforts. Furthermore, as a concept, it is limiting to design policies of neighborhood revitalization solely for those neighborhoods experiencing an influx of "pioneers", while other neighborhoods remain excluded. Second, there is a pragmatic argument to be considered which takes two forms: in the first variant, the poor do not vanish with displacement; they simply take their poverty somewhere else. Thus other neighborhoods absorb the costs of this displacement process. In the second case, from the point of view of the city as a whole, displacement can eventually breed hostility and even violence. A recent example from Philadelphia illustrates this possibility where a newly rehabilitated home was firebombed in a neighborhood where affluent whites were displacing poorer Puerto Ricans.

The next logical question then is what can be done to deal with the displacement problem? The best strategy seems to be one of first documenting the effects and then having the private and public sectors coordinate a strategy to attack the problem. Let us turn now to a consideration of some of the alternatives which are presently available at the local level.

POLICY OPTIONS AVAILABLE IN THE DISPLACEMENT ISSUE

Most strategists agree that local policies must be designed according to current and/or anticipated neighborhood conditions in their own city. Thus, a neighborhood with very little current development but good potential (e.g., a redlined neighborhood with sound housing stick close to downtown) would call for a different strategy than a neighborhood where private reinvestment is already heavily underway and middle and upper income people are moving in and posing a displacement threat. The latter may call for a strategy designed to enable the existing residents to remain in their present housing stock or to provide them meaningful and fair relocation assistance. Thus the point for any community to begin is with these questions: What's going on in the neighborhood or may go on at some future time. Who will be effected by these changes?

Thus, a city's first goal could be to centralize information on the displacement being generated by both public and private activity within the community. It would also be important to coordinate various governmental and private programs that are designed to deal with this displacement. The next step would be to communicate to residents in the affected areas their rights, and the displacement resources available to them at the state, local and federal level. (It may well be possible that the existing resources are inadequate, and that new programs may need to be derived.) I would suggest that all of these functions could be best performed in an Office of Neighborhood Affairs, perhaps within the Mayor's office. Or another alternative would be to centralize the functions within either the City Planning Department or the Department of Community Development. Some strategists prefer the Office of Neighborhood Affairs for its independence and direct focus.

Urban experts also agree that cities need to provide increased opportunities for rehabilitation for low and moderate income citizens to the same degree that they have been provided for the more affluent pioneer. Whether policy makers develop new policies or utilize existing ones, we can identify three broad categories of people that cities need to develop displacement policy for:

> Those individuals and families who are homeowners in neighborhoods undergoing revitalization. One strategy on their behalf would be the provision of long-term, low interest rehabilitation loans and grants to enable them to remain in the neighborhood. For example, the Section 312 low-interest rehabilitation program could be provided to existing residents who were made aware of the program's availability. Community Development block grant money can also be used for this purpose. Nor is there any reason why only federal money can be tapped. In fact, a number of cities have designed locally tailored projects combining the efforts of the public and private sectors.
>
> A strategy offered as a relief to rising tax assessments is the so-called, circuit-breaker tax provision. In certain cities circuit-breaker provisions keep tax rates down for designated types of citizens in neighborhoods where assessments were rising dramatically as a result of revitalization.
>
> The Low Income renter who will remain a renter. This is the person or family most in need of assistance. It is also the category which finds the least help available. Two available strategies include increased provision of Section 8, leased low-income rental housing and the passage of legislation to protect tenants rights in the displacement process. For example, some cities provide priority consideration for retaining original tenants in the rehabilitated housing accomplishing this by subsidizing tenant rent levels.
>
> Low Income renters who have the potential to be homeowners. These are people who have low income, but otherwise stable jobs and a prospect for economic improvement. Policies can be designed to enable this person to compete for homeownership in the neighborhood. Urban homesteading, or the provision of a home for virtually no cost if the

> occupant agrees to certain rehabilitation provisions, is another underutilized strategy. Community Development Block Grant money may also be used for facilitating home purchases by low income persons.

Finally, there is a recent alternative that bears consideration as a potential strategy for providing assistance to the displaced. It would permit some or all of the increase in property taxes caused by renovation or rehabilitation to be used to deal with the displacement problem by creating a "dislocation impact fund". It works like this. A local government would determine if dislocation was occuring. If the rate and intensity are deemed significant, then the neighborhood would be designated a "dislocation impact area". All or a designated proportion of the increases in property taxes occuring after a base year when revitalization began would be assigned to the fund. All the rest of the tax revenues would be assigned to the general fund. The value of the proposal is that the costs and benefits can be restricted to a single community.

SUGGESTED READINGS

1. Allman, T. D. "The Urban Crisis Leaves Town: And Moves to the Suburbs", Harper's. December 1978, 41-56.

2. Brand, Frederick N. and Smith, Richard T. "Life Adjustment and Relocation of the Elderly", Journal of Gerontology, 29, No. 1974, 336-340.

3. "Displacement: Danger Sign for Urban Revival?", Mortgage Banker. October 1978, 59-69.

4. Fried, Marc. "Grieving for a Lost Home", in Leonard J. Duhl (ed.), The Urban Condition. New York: Basic Books, 1969, 151-171.

5. Gale, Dennis E. "Dislocation of Residents", Journal of Housing. May 1978, 232-235.

6. Kollias, Karen. "Revitalization Without Displacement", HUD Challenge. March 1978, 6-7.

7. Laska, Shirley and Spain, Daphne. "Impact on a Southern City of a 'Back to City' Movement: Implications for Future Urban Problems". Paper presented at the Annual Meeting Southern Sociological Association, March 30, 1978. (Available from Dr. Laska at the University of New Orleans.)

8. League of Women Voters of Dallas, "East Dallas", mimeo, January 1979.

9. National Commission on Urban Problems, Building the American City. Washington, D.C.: 1968 (See Chapter 6 especially).

10. National Urban Coalition, "Displacement: City Neighborhoods in Transition". Washington, D.C., 1978.

11. Rubenstein, James M. and Ferguson, Robert F. "Baltimore Relocation Study: Public Program Effects on Racially-Changing Neighborhoods", Journal of Housing. November 1978, 534-538.

12. Schulz, Richard and Brenner, Gail. "Relocation of the Aged: A Review and Theoretical Analysis", Journal of Gerontology, No. 3: 1977, 323-333.

13. Short, James J. "Relocation: A Myth or Reality?", Urban Affairs Quarterly, 3, No. 1: September 1967, 62-74.

14. Tournier, Robert E. "Changing Fashion in Urban Settlement: Historical Preservation and the Rediscovery of the City". Paper presented at the Fifth Annual Conference on the Urban South, Norfolk, Va., March 1979.

15. Weiler, Conrad. Reinvestment Displacement: HUD's Role in a New Housing Issue. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Neighborhoods, 1978.

16. Wilson, James Q. (ed.) Urban Renewal: The Record and the Controversy. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1966 (See articles in Section IV).

17. Wolf, Eleanor P. and Lebeaux, Charles N. "On the Destruction of Poor Neighborhoods by Urban Renewal", Social Problems, 15, No. 1. Summer 1967, 3-8.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR SERVICE PROVISION: AN ALLIANCE FOR THE FUTURE

by

Don Hicks, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Dallas

Introduction

In the past quarter century the local public sector has assumed awesome significance in the political economy of the nation. That the vitality of the political economy is both the cause and consequence of certain limitations in the private enterprise market economy is by now a cliche. What seldom fails to astound, however, is the pace at which public sector activities have displaced as well as supplemented private sector activities at the local level. As an indication of the relentless and rapid expansion of the local public sector, consider only that for every year since 1950 taxing and spending increases by local governments have exceeded the overall rate of national productivity as measured by the GNP (Colman,1975). Furthermore, it is suggested that the bulk of our national economy is no longer insulated from public sector intrusion and influence (Gulick, 1962). Today it is estimated that one of every six Americans is employed by one of several levels of government and that perhaps half of our employment and a fourth of our GNP are directly or indirectly accounted for by the not-for-profit sector of the U.S. economy. While during the late 1960's and early 1970's the public sector accounted for nearly half of all new jobs, (Kahn, 1969), recent trends have seen federal level expansion eclipsed by state and local level expansion. While the full force of this development was not felt until the 1970's, it would be inaccurate and shortsighted to look back no further than the tumultuous sixties or even the period of recovery following the Depression to discover the elements of this trend which has gained in momentum for the past several decades. While the curious mix of ideals and institutions which gave us the New Frontier and the Great Society federal initiatives has invited our attention to these events, the antecedents of the underlying shift toward increased faith in the public domain and away from private enterprise are rooted in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This subtle development was the resultant of a variety of more obvious conditions including the growing political strength of labor unions, the social foundations of urban political machines, growing support for sacred and secular humanitarian impulses, mass democratic ideologies and institutions, and a plateau of industrialization and economic productivity that predictably generated an economic surplus available for redistribution. Further, these factors were aided and abetted by a "revolution of rising expectations" wherein government was viewed to be the tool whereby a variety of abuses and inequalities generated by a capitalist economy could be alleviated by political processes (Kahn, 1969).

The Role and Function of the Local Public Sector

Today in excess of 1.7 million nonschool employees of local governments in the United States produce a wide variety of municipal services (Lineberry, 1977). Throughout this era of heady growth, increasingly the urban public sector has assumed or been assigned the responsibility for either providing or guaranteeing an ever larger array of municipal services. Clearly evident in this recent trend are three basic and inescapable socioeconomic functions of urban government: 1) social choice making which involves decisions which result in the purchase of a mix of public and private goods and services of varying quantity and quality on behalf of the citizenry; 2) the actual production and delivery of certain goods and services through urban governmental bureaucracies; and 3) income redistribution in the sense that as a consequence of tax-financed governmental activities certain inequalities will be ameliorated, if not alleviated. This is so to the extent that the distribution of tax-financed benefits departs from the distribution of taxes in such a way that citizens with fewer resources can avail themselves of goods and services subsidized by citizens with more resources (Fitch, 1975). In this way, the inequalities which are generated and sustained by market economic processes can be redressed at least in part by political decisions in the urban political economy.

The delivery of services via the public sector reflects the fact that the provision of certain goods and services may be socially worthwhile, but have characteristics which make their provision through private enterprise unprofitable. If a good or a service is distributed or consumed in such a way that it is available to all simply on the basis of citizenship alone, the economic criterion of profitability as the condition for providing these "collective" products in society may be inadequate, inappropriate or even irrelevant. Accordingly, through political (public) initiatives rather than market (private) processes, increasingly decisions have been made to supply such collective goods to citizens whether or not they as consumers possess the resources to command those goods on their own (Kahn, 1969).

Public and Private Sector Service Delivery: Coexistence and Cooperation

Today, however, there are signs that the pendulum may be slowing down, if indeed it is not beginning to swing the other way. Governor Hugh Carey in his annual message to the New York State legislature in 1975 captured the sense of this reversal of twentieth century historical forces in this way: "So lavish was the style of our government that we came to depend on it for life itself, forgetting that government was only the result of our industry and not its source..." (Quoted in Peterson, 1976: 35). The reasons for this reversal are many and varied.

With respect to a wide variety of goods and services, the municipal public sector constitutes a monopoly. Such a monopolistic condition implies not only reduced choice from among goods and services faced by a citizen-consumer, but also reduced competition faced by the local government as the producer of these goods and services. The conventional wisdom suggests, and with good reason, that such monopolistic circumstances foster both ineffectiveness and unresponsiveness to the changing preference of consumer-citizens. Recently, it has been increasingly suggested that the provision of certain goods and services could be accomplished more effectively and economically under private rather than governmental auspices. A complete explanation for this allegation that the local public sector is inherently inefficient as a producer of goods and services is not readily available. There is much yet to be learned about the public sector provision of goods and services. A partial answer, however, has it that the public sector is heavily dependent on labor inputs. As compared with the private sector, the public sector remains ever less technologically progressive, since there is far less potential for substituting capital for labor inputs over time, and for realizing increased productivity through technological innovation (Schreiber, et al., 1976). Not surprisingly, the costs of producing public goods and services under such conditions continue to rise unchecked.

Further evidence that the pendulum may be beginning to retrace its historical arc is the trend involving citizens increasingly using their private resources to supplement the array of public services provided by local governments which they support with their taxes. This trend is especially evident in suburban jurisdictions of major metropolitan areas which have long been the residences of the relatively advantaged in society. Indicative, then, of the spending explosion in the local public sector, which has been especially evident in the larger urban areas in the U.S. (Peterson, 1976), is the fiscal dilemma facing all levels of government whereby they are now recognizing that their promises have had the tendency to outpace their capacities to deliver.

As a result of soaring costs incurred by municipalities providing an ever wider array of services, and the growing dissatisfaction with services that induces those who can afford to do so to supplement public services with private services (or move to another political jurisdiction)--a good example would be the provision of protective and security services--have been the adoption of several strategies to improve public employee productivity and hopefully blunt the upward spiral of municipal costs. Included in these strategies are: 1) increased attention to developing valid measures of the quality and quantity of public service output; 2) heightened awareness of service quality and cost comparisons across jurisdictional lines; 3) increasingly incorporating elements of private market competition into urban bureaucracies; and 4) complete or partial "privatization" of certain municipal functions (Colman, 1975).

Of these strategies, the latter two most clearly illustrate the realization that public sector capabilities have limits too, and that certain virtues of the private sector may have been less than fully appreciated in recent times. After social and political factors have determined that the provision and distribution of certain goods and services to all citizens should not hinge on whether or not there is the promise of profit for a private entrepreneur, the urban political economy provides a stage for what follows. Today, urban governments are increasingly aware of an array of alternatives that they have once they have accepted such service responsibilities. While they may assume responsibility for providing a particular service (e.g., sanitation), it need not follow that they must provide it directly themselves. Their choices include: 1) providing the service directly through the tax-financed public sector; 2) arranging via contract for another governmental jurisdiction (e.g., special interests) to provide the service; or 3) arranging via contract for a private contractor to provide the service. The second and third alternatives share the advantage of separating the governmental unit that receives the demand from citizen-consumers from the ultimate producer of the good or service. Since these latter strategies require a contractual understanding between a local government and either another governmental unit or a private contractor, both alternatives institutionalize competition and provide the incentives for the producing unit to deliver a product at the lowest possible cost (Schreiber, et al., 1976).

Private Provision of Public Services

Of the three alternative strategies sketched above, the third--the private provision of public services--merits special attention. Renewed interest in providing some traditional public services via private enterprise is a response to more than simply the pressure of rising costs on local public sector inputs (especially labor costs) or the neoconservative article of faith that government is better at providing incentives than services and should rely more on market mechanisms and less on bureaucratic programs to achieve social goals. Beyond this, there is hard evidence amassed in the literatures of various academic and professional disciplines to the effect that the private profit making sector can deliver certain services at a cost below that of the public sector. Also, local government contracting with the private sector would then provide a useful yardstick against which the performance of the public sector could be measured within the same political jurisdiction.

Finally, there exists an ever larger number of private firms which increasingly realize that the local public sector may be a vast untapped and lucrative business market for them in the future (Fisk, et al., 1978).

At the same time, such public-private sector negotiations concerning the delivery of traditional public services face several impediments as well. Certain traditional local government services are relatively intangible and their dimensions only vaguely defined; therefore, not only is service quality difficult to define, but the production, delivery and measurement of impact of these services faces a variety of uncertainties that may well inhibit private sector entry into negotiations. Secondly, older services where the local government already has in place the necessary service infrastructure tend to be just those services which would be most attractive to private enterprise; this is due in part to these services being more tangible and their production processes being relatively better understood (e.g., police protection). Yet, it is newer services to which the public sector would like to attract potential private sector suppliers, in part because the private sector may be able to respond to needs more quickly and in part because the services could then be provided without increasing the size of the urban public bureaucracy. These factors are particularly attractive for political jurisdictions experiencing rapid population or economic growth in the short run. Most evidence of private provision of public services through purchase-of-service contracting has come from jurisdictions experiencing recent population growth. Another factor influencing when, if, and under what conditions private delivery of public services will commence relates to the uniqueness of the service and how often it is needed. The likelihood of private sector provision will be enhanced if a particular service requires highly specialized skills or facilities and is needed infrequently or on an ad hoc basis. Finally, the availability of firms to supply a service, of sufficient size to meet the needs of the entire population or in sufficient numbers so that a coalition of private providers might meet the public need, is also an important factor (Fisk, et al., 1978).

Advantages and Disadvantages of Private Delivery

Since today local governments frequently face the decision of how best to meet service needs in an era characterized by widespread opposition to increased taxes and an expanded public sector, it is essential that responsible public officials weigh carefully the advantages and disadvantages of opting for private provision of traditional public services. A recent report prepared by the Urban Institute has suggested the following possible advantages and disadvantages of private delivery be considered. (Fisk, et al., 1978: 6-9).

Advantages of Private Delivery

1. May cost less or provide better performance. Competition and the profit motive are presumed to act in the same way in government purchase-of-service agreements as they do in private contracting. On the assumption that the price of a service will approach the cost of production as a result of competition, competition should lead either to a lower cost for equivalent service or to better performance at a similar cost.
2. Provides specialized skills. Some public services require specialized skills that are used infrequently. Through contracting, the best-qualified persons can be obtained as needed; this practice will lead to better service or lower cost.
3. Limits the growth of government. Contracting offers a way to restrict the number of government employees to governments concerned

with this issue. Restricting the number of employees by contracting some services, however, does not necessarily lower total public expenditures.

4. Avoids large initial costs. Contracting often permits rapid initiation of new projects without large initial outlays for facilities, equipment, and training of personnel--assuming that private suppliers have made this investment.

5. Permits greater flexibility in adjusting program size. Contracting permits flexibility in increasing or reducing (particularly the latter) program operations without lengthy negotiations with municipal employees.

6. Provides a yardstick for comparison. In some service areas, a few governments produce part of a service and contract for the balance; the difference provides a yardstick by which they can compare efficiency and effectiveness.

7. Promotes increased objectivity. Contracting permits separation of day-to-day operations from planning and evaluation. This may increase the objectivity with which a government examines current operations, including expansion or contraction.

8. Produces better management. Through contracting, government managers can devote their attention to planning and monitoring rather than managing day-to-day operations. The contractor can devote his attention to routine operating problems. Such specializaton can lead to better municipal management.

9. Produces better management information. Contracting should require explicit statements of the work to be performed and detailed monitoring to make sure that the terms of the contract are fulfuilled. This process can generate information which in many instances is otherwise unavailable to local government.

Disadvantages of Private Delivery

1. May cost more. Contracting involves costs in government administration, and the contractor's profit (or fees) must be added to the government's cost of doing business. Consequently, contracting for services by a private concern can be more expensive than public delivery.
2. May result in poorer service for citizens. Since the objective of private firms is to maximize profits, a firm may skimp on its service whenever it can in order to increase its profits.
3. Increases chance of corruption. Because of the desire of private firms to obtain contracts and to increase profits, great pressure may exist for contractors to engage in various questionable or illegal practices, such as bribery, kickbacks, and payoffs.
4. Raises the possibliity that a contractor may not complete operations. Unlike government, contractors may go bankrupt or cease operations. The results can be serious if a local government has not prepared a standby plan.
5. Displaces public employees and draws opposition from municipal unions. Contracting existing government services can raise serious problems if job actions or costly legal challenges by employee associations or unions take place to prevent loss of jobs.
6. Raises problems in drawing up adequate contracts. In many service areas it is extremely difficult to formulate contracts that will ensure that a government receives the services it wants and agrees to pay for.
7. May be restricted by law. Use of purchase-of-service agreements is prohibited or restricted by state and federal laws in some service areas.

8. May entail problems in enforcing public policies. Governments enforce many public policy objectives, such as equal opportunity advancement. Contracting may make some of these more difficult (but by no means impossible) to enforce.

9. Fails to guarantee adequate competition for certain contracts. For certain services such as fire protection, few, if any, private firms exist to provide the service in most places.

10. Reduces flexibility of response to change. Since contracts have to be written in very specific terms, a government does not have the ability to respond quickly to major changes in service requests. Moreover, renegotiation can be a costly process.

11. Provides less control over the final service. Because of the difficulty of writing and enforcing performance contracts, particularly those which focus on the quantity and quality of final products and services, a government may lose some degree of control over these products and services.

12. May interfere with community tradition that calls for government provisions. Tradition rather than legal constraints is sometimes mentioned as a reason against switching to purchase-of-service contracts, particularly in the older, established communities.

13. Requires close monitoring. To ensure that a government receives what it pays for requires detailed monitoring of the contractor's activities. This problem does not exist, at least not to the same degree, when a government produces the service itself and all employees are under its direct control.

Suggested Readings

1. Bollens, John C. and Henry J. Schmandt, The Metropolis: Its People, Politics, and Economic Life, Third Edition, Harper & Row, New York, 1975.
2. Colman, William G., Cities, Suburbs, and States: Governing and Financing Urban America, Free Press, New York, 1975.
3. Fisk, Donald, Herbert Kiesling and Thomas Muller, Private Provision of Public Services: An Overview, The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C., 1978.
4. Fitch, Lyle C., "Fiscal and Productive Efficiency in Urban Government Systems," in Amos H. Hawley and Vincent P. Rock, (eds.), Metropolitan America In Contemporary Perspective, Halsted, New York, 1975.
5. Goldfield, David R. and Blaine A. Brownell, Urban America: From Downtown to No Town, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1979.
6. Gorham, William and Nathan Glazer, The Urban Predicament, The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C., 1976.
7. Gulick, Luther, The Metropolitan Problem and American Ideas, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1962.
8. Hawley, Amos H. and Vincent P. Rock, (eds.), Metropolitan America in Contemporary Perspective, Halsted, New York, 1975.
9. Kahn, Alfred J., Theory and Practice of Social Planning, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1969.
10. Lineberry, Robert L., Equality and Urban Policy: The Distribution of Municipal Public Services, Sage, Beverly Hills, 1977.

11. Ostrom, Elinor, (ed.), The Delivery of Urban Services: Outcomes of Change, Sage, Beverly Hills, 1976.

12. Peterson, George E., "Finance," in William Gorham and Nathan Glazer, (eds.), The Urban Predicament, The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C., 1976.

13. Schreiber, Arthur F., Paul K. Gatons and Richard B. Clemmer, The Economics of Urban Problems: An Introduction, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1976.

THE LITERARY VIEW OF AGING

by

Caroline Galerstein, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Dallas

Grow old along with me!

The best is yet to be,

The last of life for which the first was made:

Robert Browning's Rabbi Ben Ezra thus exhorts us to grow old cheerfully, looking forward to peaceful, contented last years, our wisdom respected, and curious about what God has in store for us at the end.

The world's literature abounds with reference to the joys and glories of old age. In the _Iliad_ Nestor, the eldest of the Greeks, is accorded the most honor, and Homer makes him the wisest and most eloquent of the Greek heroes. Though he is no longer as strong as he once was, his age does not prevent him from taking a courageous part in the battle.

Countless poets have sought to ease the pain of growing old by reminding us of the value of experience. "Is not old wine wholesomest, old pippins toothsomest? Does not old wood burn brightest, old linen wash whitest?" John Webster asks. However, this may be small comfort to those of us who are growing old in the last quarter of the twentieth century. Alghough only five percent of the elderly population of the United States are living in institutions of some kind, we have a view of old people as suffering from loneliness and aloneness, neglect, impoverishment, malnutrition and various physical and mental ailments.

Philosophers from Plato to Simone de Beauvoir have spoken of the tribulations of old age, and the poets are aware that old age is a burden. W.B Yeats refers to "Decrepit age that has been tied to me/ As to a dog's tail." People fear not only the deterioration of old age, but also the loss of status, worrying that they will appear foolish to the young. T.S. Eliot has expressed it: "Do not let me hear/ of the wisdom of old men, but rather of their folly/ Their fear of fear and frenzy..." Great writers know that old age takes courage, and they know its weaknesses and miseries as well as the gerontologists do. Creative writers are better able to express human feelings and to elicit an emotional response in the reader than are the writers of psychological and sociological reports. What can compare with the anguish of King Lear as he is cast aside by his daughters, or the suffering of Pere Goriot as he ruins himself in order to provide luxuries for his selfish, frivolous daughters? This theme of the complexity of the relationships between old fathers and adult children is more recently explored in Robert Anderson's "I Never Sang for My Father," as the father annoys his son with his stubbornness, insensitivity and constant repetition of stories. He rejects his son's efforts to help him, maintaining that he is capable of taking care of himself; but he dies in "complete and speechless senility...sitting in his wheelchair and staring without comprehension at television...alone."

Analyzing another aspect of aging, many authors remind us that the passions do not die with old age. Junichiro Tanizaki, in his novel Diary of a Mad Old Man, presents us with an old man who develops a fetish for his daughter-in-law's foot. Italo Svevo's As A Man Grows Older shows how natural it is for older men to long to possess the charms of younger women. In old age we can enjoy nostalgia, but we also have time to dwell on mistakes. "Youth is a blunder; manhood a struggle; old age a regret," says Benjamin Disraeli.

Senior activist groups have recently attacked the propensity of many television shows, especially situation comedies, to show old people as at least foolish, if not totally brainless. Those who satirize the old and consider them foolish also have their precedents in literature.

Recall Lewis Carroll's

"You are old, Father William," the young man said
"And your hair has become very white;
And yet you incessantly stand on your head -
Do you think at your age, it is right?"

October Light, John Gardner's 1976 novel, and Don Coburn's recent Broadway success The Gin Game make the point that old people must learn to live with each other. The latter work is a two-character drama which depicts a man and woman relegated to a home for the aged. He is irascible and egotistical; she is spiteful and ashamed to admit that she is on welfare and that her son has no interest in her and rejects all contact with her. Together they scoff at the attempts of the home to "entertain" the residents and are naturally resentful of the condescensions and humiliations which the staff perpetrate upon them. Both feel themselves physically and mentally superior to the other residents. "I'm the part of (this thing here) that's breathing," insists Weller. "Don't you kid yourself, this isn't anything more than a warehouse for the intellectually and emotionally dead. Nothing more than a place to store them until their bodies quit." Since neither ever has any visitors, Weller and Fonsia pass the time playing gin rummy. Fonsia invariably wins, a fact which causes Weller's anger to mount. His anger, which turns to violence, and her prissiness, which eventually gives way and allows her to return at least some of Weller's profanity, demonstrate the frustration of age and the need which the two people have for each other, although they cannot come to terms with each other's problems. The Gin Game is one of a number of popular plays in recent years which portray real old people in real situations facing real problems. Literature is full of dotty grandpas tottering around, or in various states of senility, but some more recent literature has presented a more understanding point of view.

The frailties of old age are beautifully, yet humorously, depicted by Muriel Spark in her 1959 novel Momemto Mori, in which she dissects the moral character as well as the physical disabilities of a group of middle-class English people, all in their eighties or late seventies. This group has known each other since the turn of the century; they have been lovers; they have been jealous of each other and have blackmailed each other. Now they comment on each other's deterioration, attend each other's funerals, worry about who will have to go into a home, and fret about each other's wills. They are preyed upon, not by the young, but by a housekeeper who is in her early seventies and very "well preserved." Godfrey Colston is proud of the fact that in his eighties he still has all of his "faculties;" and the saddest thing he can think of to say about a friend is, "He has lost his faculties." His wife Charmian, once a celebrated novelist, does not remember very well, and doesn't always know who the people around her are; but a revival of interest in her novels also sparks a rejuvenation of her interest in life and thus an increased sharpness of "faculties." Miss Taylor, once Charmian's housekeeper, lives in a hospital ward with seven aged women, all of whom are addressed by the staff and visitors as "Granny." Miss Taylor's humiliating situation, which she handles with stoic dignity, is juxtaposed with the Colstons, who can afford to remain in their own home but who are still subject to humiliations to which their advanced age leaves them exposed. Their friend Alec Warner, a sociologist, provides a view of a more active old age as he jots down on file cards all the reactions he observes in his aged friends. Everyone in the group, regardless of financial condition, regardless of social status, regardless of the secrets of the past, receives phone calls from an anonymous caller who simply states, "Remember you must die." For some the caller is a young man; for some he is old; to some his voice sounds well educated; others find it crude. For one person the caller is a woman. The police are helpless to find the culprit because it is, or course, Death himself calling, reminding us all of the inevitable end of old age.

Writers such as Coburn and Spark have continued a tradition in Western literature which reaches back to the Bible: the effort of writers, philosophers and artists to analyze how each human being deals with old age. Today the psychologist, sociologist and physician may be center stage as they proffer their scientific data on the physical and mental deterioration of age and offer advice as to how society should handle the social problems engendered by the fact that people are living longer in a changing world. But we should not ignore the insights into these problems which great works of literature have to offer. It is true that many literary works tend to prolong stereotypical notions about aging which current research has disproved; still it is to the great writers that we return for their understanding of human nature and individuals. Their words help us to understand what is happening to those around us who are growing old and thus to develop a better view of ourselves as we grow older. These writers offer us a myriad of choices. We can grow old joyfully with Rabbi Ben Ezra, or we can view ourselves at the end of our lives as being in Shakespeare's seventh stage of man:

> Last scene of all,
> That ends this strange eventful history
> Is second childishness and mere oblivion -
> Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Langone, John. Long Life: What We Know and Are Learning About the Aging Process. Boston: Little Brown, 1978.

Spicker, Stuart F. et. al. (eds.) Aging and the Elderly. Humanistic Perspectives in Gerontology. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1978.

Storey, David. Home. New York: S. French, 1971.

Thompson, Ernest. On Golden Pond. (unpublished play)

Updike, John. The Poorhouse Fair. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1958.

Weinstock, Ruth. The Graying of the Campus. New York: Educational Facilities Laboratory, 1978.

APPENDIX

As discussed in the introduction, many persons considering a given policy topic need information from a number of perspectives. Groups or agencies just beginning consideration of a policy issue, for example, need to consider materials such as the previous ten articles which examine the basic conceptual aspects of the policy issue at hand. For agencies further along in the policy formulation process, however, information is needed which can identify available community resources and/or materials previously generated by other researchers or policy specialists.

The attached computer generated printouts are representative of searches conducted by PIIN staff during a ten month service period to meet the needs of groups in this secondary stage of policy development. Over 100 searches were conducted covering such diverse topics as youth, transportation for the elderly, cable television, solid waste disposal, migrant farm workers, and exclusionary zoning. Information for these policy questions was drawn from two distinct computerized information systems. These two systems, the Community Information Source (APL/CAT) and national level information brokers, provided users with customized, cost-effective, current, and comprehensive policy related information. The following brief overviews of these two systems describe the coverage and capabilities of these systems. As was the case prior to the implementation of the PIIN project, these services are available through the Dallas Public Library on a fee-for-service basis.

Community Information Source (APL/CAT)

The Community Information Source (APL/CAT) is a computerized information bank of agencies, programs, services, and other resources in North Central Texas representing the major aspects of human service, educational opportunities, community interests and concerns, and information resources on public issues.

This information bank is continually expanded and updated under the joint sponsorship of the Dallas Public Library and the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG).

The valuable, up-to-date information in APL/CAT is available to public and private groups on an annual subscription basis or through individual requests for:

- Information on services currently available that can be used in planning for new or expanded services,
- Locating other organizations with similar objectives or services so as to develop cooperative programs,
- Basic information to use in general planning and coordination activities,
- Assistance in meeting requirements for citizen and interest group involvement in planning processes,
- Information and referral services to the public.

APL/CAT is currently managed jointly by the Library and NCTCOG. The Library is responsible for the maintenance and development of the data base and for answering inquiries. The NCTCOG is responsible for fiscal management, for demonstrating the system to local governments and agencies, and for handling subscriptions to the system.

The Library and NCTCOG are now involved in modifying APL/CAT to make it more economical and in expanding its geographic coverage. These processes are supported partially by grant funds and partially by subscriptions. In addition to this support, staff for APL/CAT is provided by the Library, by NCTCOG, and by CETA.

A sample of an APL/CAT search and its results on the identification of homeowners groups and neighborhood associations in Dallas County is provided in the gold colored portion of this appendix.

National Information Retrieval Services

The National Information Retrieval Service is a collection of nationally available computerized information resources available through the Dallas Public Library. This collection includes the Lockheed DIALOG, SDC ORBIT, New York Times Information Bank, and LEGISLATE systems. Between these four systems, over 100 topic-specific data bases are available covering subjects in the general areas of social science, political science, engineering, environment, chemistry, biology, education, and business. Each topic-specific data base may cover thousands of professional and trade journals, conferences, or technical papers, with citations (and often abstracts) to hundreds of thousands of references.

Searches may be conducted either through single key words or combinations of key words to locate the specific information needed. The light yellow portion of this appendix reflects a search on the topic of exclusionary zoning. As can be noted in the headings on each page of the printout, references to articles on this topic were drawn from data bases geared to history, social science, and business.

```
WELCOME TO APL/CAT, THE COMMUNITY ACCESS TOOL

ENTER SEARCHES:

P1:  1 NEIGHBORHOODS ∨ 2 HOMEOWNERS
P1:  1 NEIGHBORHOODS ∨ 2 HOMEOWNERS  92  FOUND.

P2:  CO 2
P2:  CO 2  4241  FOUND.

P3:  END
ENTER LOGIC(S):

L1:  P1∧P2
L1:  P1∧P2  84 FOUND.

L2:
603

ACTION:  L1 REPORT 3
POSITION PAPER.
```

Code for Dallas County

```
240020018
DALLAS, CITY OF, DEPT OF HOUSING AND URBAN REHABILITATION,
 HOME LOAN SECTION, URBAN HOMESTEADING PROGRAM
C C MORRIS, URBAN HOMESTEADING COORDINATOR
DALLAS MUNICIPAL CENTER, ROOM 6DS
DALLAS, TX
75201
(214) 670 3644
----------

241020002
HOUSING OPPORTUNITY CENTER, GREATER DALLAS
DR CHARLES A HUNTER, PRESIDENT
1907 ELM ST, 1708 TOWER BLDG
DALLAS, TX
75201
(214) 748 1034
----------

242020082
COMMUNITY RENEWAL AGENCY, GRAND PRAIRIE
RAY PHILLIPS, DIRECTOR
1421 DENSMAN ST
GRAND PRAIRIE, TX
75051
(214) 263 1161
----------
```

```
244020001
ACORN, COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS FOR REFORM NOW, DALLAS OFFICE
SCOTT HOLLADAY, DIRECTOR
4415 SAN JACINTO AT CARROLL
DALLAS, TX
75204
(214) 823 4580
----------

244020002
BOIS D ARC PATRIOTS
CHARLIE YOUNG, COORDINATOR
107 N COLLETT AVE
DALLAS, TX
75214
(214) 827 2632
----------

244020003
EAST DALLAS NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGN COMMITTEE
JOHN JORDAN, PRESIDENT
6216 SARATOGA CIR
DALLAS, TX
75214
(214) 824 5503 (214) 823 3071
----------

244020004
BOIS D ARC PATRIOTS,
 EAST DALLAS TENANTS AND SMALL HOMEOWNERS ALLIANCE
SUE GEER, CONTACT
107 N COLLETT
DALLAS, TX
75214
(214) 827 2632
----------

244020005
EAST KESSLER NEIGHBORHOOD CLUB
GENE MCDONALD
722 W DAVIS
DALLAS, TX
75208
(214) 941 2411
----------

244020006
HIGHLAND COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION
DAVID BRASS, PRESIDENT
9740 RAVENS WAY
DALLAS, TX
75238
(214) 341 0986
----------
```

244020007
HOMEOWNERS LEAGUE, DALLAS
ANDREW SCHOENEBERGER, PRESIDENT
10407 MEDGEWAY DRIVE
DALLAS, TX
75229
(214) 357 5010 (214) 239 2351

244020008
LAKELAND HILLS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
NICK BERT, PRESIDENT
2554 ST FRANCIS
DALLAS, TX
75228
(214) 321 3486 (214) 823 8551

244020010
NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING SERVICES OF DALLAS, INC
BILLIE RICHARDS, ACTING DIRECTOR
4923 W LOVERS LN
DALLAS, TX
75209
(214) 358 4414

244020011
NORTHERN HILLS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
LAURA RUBINFIELD, PRESIDENT
3623 CRAIGMONT
DALLAS, TX
75205
(214) 522 1598 (214) 521 8289

244020012
OLD OAK CLIFF CONSERVATION LEAGUE
ROBERT HICHMAN, PRESIDENT
P O BOX 4027
DALLAS, TX
75208
(214) 943 4885 (214) 233 1871 (214) 942 0424

244020013
OAK LAWN HEIGHTS HOMEOWNERS
JAMES GILMER, PRESIDENT
2910 MAPLE SPRINGS
DALLAS, TX
75235
(214) 526 9747

244020014
OAK LAWN PRESERVATION SOCIETY
ERLE RAWLINS, JR, PRESIDENT
6725 SNIDER PLZ
DALLAS, TX
75205
(214) 363 1555 (214) 526 4130

244020015
ROUTH FAIRMOUNT PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION
CHAPMAN KELLEY, PRESIDENT
C/O CHAPMAN KELLY, 2526 FAIRMOUNT
DALLAS, TX
75201
(214) 747 9971

244020016
TENANTS UNION, DALLAS
DOROTHY MASTERSON, COORDINATOR
3525 STATE ST, WASHINGTON PRESBYTERIAN MISSION
DALLAS, TX
75204
(214) 823 6510

244020024
MAGNA VISTA CEDAR VIEW ASSOCIATION, INC
J C PHELPS, JR, PRESIDENT
2804 MAGNA VISTA DR
DALLAS, TX
75216
(214) 376 8170

244020025
VINEYARD NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
NELSON SPENCER, PRESIDENT
2800 ROUTH ST, SUITE 220
DALLAS, TX
75201
(214) 651 0129

244020026
SPRING CREEK CIVIC ORGANIZATION
WANDA MANN, PRESIDENT
7811 ROLLING ACRES
DALLAS, TX
75248
(214) 239 3643 (214) 239 6974

244020027
NOTTINGHAM NEIGHBORS CLUB
MRS BOB HUNT
2413 KINGSBRIDGE
GRAND PRAIRIE, TEXAS
75050
(214) 641 8740

244020028
HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, GARLAND
RICHARD KORDUS, PRESIDENT
P O BOX 40374
GARLAND, TX
75040
(214) 272 6941 (214) 276 5882

244020029
URBAN HOMESTEADERS ASSOCIATION
PHILLIS ASHBY, PRESIDENT
P O BOX 8866
DALLAS, TX
75216
(214) 943 8630

244020030
KESSLER NEIGHBORS UNLIMITED
PATRICK HEATH, PRESIDENT
1107 N CLINTON
DALLAS, TX
75208
(214) 941 7495 (214) 946 0923

244020031
OAK LAWN CITIZENS COMMITTEE
AERIAL PEUGH, PRESIDENT
P O BOX 57131
DALLAS, TX
75207
(214) 522 8116

244020032
JOHN IRELAND AREA HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
ALICE M WOOD, PRESIDENT
1565 GILLETTE ST
DALLAS, TX
75217
(214) 391 1252

244020033
NORTH CENTRAL DALLAS CIVIC ASSOCIATION
MARY G CRAWFORD
6472 HIGHGATE LN
DALLAS, TX
75214
(214) 363 7171

244020034
HILLCREST MANOR HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
VICKI CARLTON, PRESIDENT
7319 BLITHESDALE
DALLAS, TX
75248
(214) 386 4551 (214) 661 5605

244020035
SOUTH AND CENTRAL DALLAS CIVIC ASSOCIATION
KATHLYN GILLIAN AND OSBORN CALDWELL, COCHAIRPERSONS
3817 WENDELKIN
DALLAS, TX
75215
(214) 428 0576 (214) 421 1098

244020036
FOREST LANE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
R W MATHIAS, CHAIRMAN
4528 MENDENHALL DR
DALLAS, TX
75234
(214) 233 8429 (214) 688 6117

244020037
PEOPLES PARK COMMITTEE, EAST DALLAS
TERRY FORD, CHAIRPERSON
5128 EAST SIDE
DALLAS, TX
75214
(214) 823 6713 (214) 824 0663 (214) 742 1631

244020038
CEDAR CREEK IMPROVEMENT CLUB
MARTHA THOMPSON, PRESIDENT
1218 COMPTON
DALLAS, TX
75203
(214) 946 8767

244020039
CELESTIAL NOEL HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
JEAN RICHMOND, PRESIDENT
5530 CELESTIAL RD
DALLAS, TX
75240
(214) 239 4550 (214) 692 2515

244020040
PRESTON CITADEL CLUB
BETTIE FULLHART
6431 LINDEN LN
DALLAS, TX
75230
(214) 661 1660 (214) 239 7427

244020043
HAMILTON PARK CIVIC LEAGUE ASSOCIATION
CHARLES E SMITH, PRESIDENT
12103 BELLAFONTE DR
DALLAS, TX
75243
(214) 464 7706 (214) 235 5709

244020044
HIGHLAND WEST HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
ANDY TUNA, PRESIDENT
9136 DUNMOORE PL
DALLAS, TX
75231
(214) 349 0246 (214) 349 0647

244020045
MESQUITE HEIGHTS WRECKING ASSOCIATION
ED WARD
P O BOX 363
DUNCANVILLE, TX
75116
(214) 298 7924

244020046
HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, NORTHEAST DALLAS
FRANK CRANE, PRESIDENT
3514 LENDON WOOD AVE
DALLAS, TX
75205
(214) 528 2280 (214) 528 4713

244020047
INNER CITY IMPROVEMENTS COMMITTEE
ARTHUR HUGHES, PRESIDENT
2912 STATE ST
DALLAS, TX
75204
(214) 827 6849 (214) 631 4010 (214) 824 5823 (214) 653 1938

244020048
MERRIMAN PARK ESTATES CLUB, INC
NORM DUGGLEBY, PRESIDENT
7119 COSGROVE DR
DALLAS, TX
75231
(214) 348 9173

244020049
MIDWAY PROTECTIVE LEAGUE
MR AND MRS ARTHUR L OWEN
4327 MARGATE DR
DALLAS, TX
75220
(214) 747 6500 (214) 352 3862

244020050
MOUNT AUBURN, SANTE FE NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION
FLORENCE KNIPPA, PRESIDENT
603 GRANDVIEW
DALLAS, TX
75223
(214) 350 8771

244020051
MUNCIE AVENUE COMMUNITY GROUP
HELEN EMORY, PRESIDENT
811 MUNCIE AVE
DALLAS, TX
75212
(214) 747 0297 (214) 638 3599

244020052
NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT CLUB, SOUTHEAST DALLAS
ETHEL PARNELL
3819 PINE ST
DALLAS, TX
75210
(214) 421 7931

244020053
PRESTON CENTER WEST HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
JOAN C MULCAHY, SECRETARY
5423 STONEGATE
DALLAS, TX
75209
(214) 352 6197

244020054
PRESTON HOLLOW HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
WILLIAM HAMILTON, PRESIDENT
5910 PARK LN
DALLAS, TX
75225
(214) 748 4541 (214) 368 8644 (214) 363 1134

244020055
PRESTON ROYAL HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
ROBERT L OWENS, PRESIDENT
6214 NORWAY RD
DALLAS, TX
75230
(214) 655 1500

244020056
RED BIRD HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
GERALD HUGHES, PAST PRESIDENT
6607 S HAMPTON
DALLAS, TX
75232
(214) 371 6949 (214) 339 6321

244020058
SENIOR CITIZENS NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION, EAST DALLAS
ODENA BRANNAN, CHAIRPERSON
5307 PARRY
DALLAS, TX
75223
(214) 826 0353

244020059
SINGING HILLS NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION
BILLIE RICHARDS, FACILITATOR
1612 WAGON SHEELS TR 1612 WAGON WHEELS TR
DALLAS, TX
75241
(214) 750 5257 (214) 375 5565 (214) 375 1733

244020060
STEERING COMMITTEE, SOUTH DALLAS
J B JACKSON, CHAIRMAN
P O BOX 15752
DALLAS, TX
75215
(214) 428 2407 (214) 670 8367 (214) 421 0333

244020061
STULTZ ROAD NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION
SEWELL CUTLER, CHAIRMAN
8453 GREENSTONE
DALLAS, TX
75243
(214) 348 5152 (214) 239 8133

244020062
TIOGA/PRESTON GREEN HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC
BOB KILCULLEN, PRESIDENT
6726 SOUTHPOINT
DALLAS, TX
7524[illegible]
(214) 23[illegible] [illegible]273

244020063
TOWN HOUSE ROW ASSOCIATION
ALEX KINNER, PRESIDENT
8515 TOWN HOUSE ROW
DALLAS, TX
75225
(214) 363 0047 (214) 363 4088 (214) 630 9431

244020064
TRINITY VALLEY COMMUNITY
REV C HORTON
4723 NORMA
DALLAS, TX
75247
(214) 631 6966

244020065
VALLEY VIEW HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
RUTHY WILSON
13137 TAHOE
DALLAS, TX
75240
(214) 239 1068

244020066
WALNUT HILL HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
CULLEN A ROGERS, PRESIDENT
10156 BETTY JANE PL
DALLAS, TX
75229
(214) 750 5140 (214) 357 4014

244020067
WEST OAK CLIFF ALLIANCE OF NEIGHBORS
BARBARA MARTIN, CHAIRPERSON
3229 KIESTHILL DR
DALLAS, TX
75233
(214) 339 6952

244020068
WEST MESQUITE HEIGHTS ASSOCIATION
EDWARD LEE WARD
P O BOX 363
DUNCANVILLE, TX
75116
(214) 298 7924

244020069
WEST WHITE ROCK HOMEOWNERS
ALTO CERVIN, PRESIDENT
4343 W LAWTHER DR
DALLAS, TX
75214
(214) 827 3155 (214) 741 5277 (214) 823 6867

244020072
FRUITDALE COMMUNITY GROUP
LACEY DARENSBOURG, PRESIDENT
4627 HEDGDON
DALLAS, TX
75216
(214) 374 8897 (214) 371 5974

244020073
PRESTON HOLLOW WEST ASSOCIATION
MR AND MRS DAVID MUNSON, PRESIDENT
5128 BROOKVIEW
DALLAS, TX
75220
(214) 368 5128 (214) 363 9406
------ --

125

244020074
SOUTH BOULEVARD/PARK ROW HISTORICAL PRESERVATION ASSOCIATION
DR ALFRED L ROBERTS, PRESIDENT
2419 SOUTH BLVD
DALLAS, TX
75215
(214) 428 3768 (214) 421 4296

244020076
WEST DALLAS COMMUNITY GROUP
EMMA CARTER, CHAIRPERSON
4120 MART ST
DALLAS, TX
75212
(214) 631 1586 (214) 747 2754

244020077
CONCERNED CITIZENS OF GLENVIEW
REV R B BROWN, MODERATOR
2701 S MARSALIS
DALLAS, TX
75216
(214) 941 2277 (214) 574 6631

244020078
UNITED NEIGHBORS
FLORENE KNIPPA, CHAIRWOMAN
107 N COLLETT
DALLAS, TX
75214
(214) 827 2632

244020079
VECINOS UNIDOS
TERRY FORD
107 N COLLETT
DALLAS, TX
75214
(214) 827 2632

244020080
SULLIVAN ADDITION RESIDENTS COUNCIL
HATTIE MAE JONES
512 ARMSTRONG
SEAGOVILLE, TX
75159
(214) 287 4841

125/a

244020081
NORTHPARK/LOVE FIELD CIVIC LEAGUE
JOYCE LOCKLEY, PRESIDENT
4718 WATEKA
DALLAS, TX
75209
(214) 352 6271 (214) 261 9043

244020082
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF DALLAS, TEXAS,
COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPT
DR MONICA LETT, DIRECTOR
2525 LUCAS DR
DALLAS, TX
75219
(214) 526 8581 (X) 49 (X) 31 (X) 52

246020001
U S DEPT OF HUD, COUNSELING SERVICES PROGRAM
PATRICIA THARP, HOUSING COUNSELOR
2001 BRYAN TOWER
DALLAS, TX
75201
(214) 749 3211

265020005
BOIS D ARC PATRIOTS, COMMUNITY CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAM
JOHN FULENWIDER
107 NORTH COLLETT AVE
DALLAS, TX
75214
(214) 827 2632

270020010
DALLAS, CITY OF, DEPT OF URBAN PLANNING,
ENVIRONMENTAL AND NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS
RAYMOND E STANLAND, PROGRAM MANAGER
DALLAS CITY HALL, RM 5BN
DALLAS, TX
75201
(214) 670 4185

274020001
A BEAUTIFUL CLEAN DALLAS
WILLIAM MOORE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
714 FIDELITY UNION TOWER
DALLAS, TX
75201
(214) 748 2274

281020003
HISTORIC PRESERVATION LEAGUE, DALLAS
KATHERINE SLICK, PRESIDENT
202 S ERVAY, 518
DALLAS, TX
75201
(214) 742 6955 (214) 826 4506

502020037
GARLAND, CITY OF, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPT
RONALD E JONES, ACTING DIRECTOR
1022 HIGH MEADOW
GARLAND, TX
75040
(214) 271 4658

541020043
LOS BARRIOS UNIDOS, INC
PETE MARTINEZ, PRESIDENT
1416 CANADA PL
DALLAS, TX
75212
(214) 742 7701

591020394
ST LUKES UNITED METHODIST CHURCH
REV CHARLES DENMAN
2408 GILFORD
DALLAS, TX
75235
(214) 352 9455

600020003
BLOCK PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM
OEITA BOTTORFF, COORDINATOR
2801 PEABODY
DALLAS, TX
75215
(214) 421 5281

Print 1/5/1-3
DIALOG File38: AMERICA: HIST & LIFE 63-77/ISS04 (Copr. ABC Clio Inc.) (Item 1 of 3) User5296 5mar79

0378491 14A-07990
THE POLITICS OF EXCLUSIONARY ZONING IN SUBURBIA.
Danielson, Michael N.
Publ: Pol. Sci. Q. 1976 91(1): 1-18.

Discusses the factors that account for local resistance to opening the suburbs to subsidized housing. Argues that lack of incentives for local officials and residents, combined with the weak articulation of latent sources of support for open housing, tend to preclude significant policy change from within suburbia.
J
Identifiers: Zoning, exclusionary ; Suburbs ; Housing, subsidized

0274501 12A-04264
NEWARK: PARASITIC SUBURBS.
Taylor, Clark.
Publ: Society 1972 9(10): 35-41.

Through the property tax system, exclusionary zoning, and job shifts, the suburbs of Newark have exploited the inner city poor. One of four articles in this issue on ""The Nation of Newark.''
S
Identifiers: City Government ; New Jersey (Newark) ; Suburbs, parasitic ; Poor, inner city

0222309 11A-02303
HIGHWAYS AS A BARRIER TO EQUAL ACCESS.
Rabin, Yale.
Publ: Ann. of the Am. Acad. of Pol. and Social Sci. 1973 (407): 63-77.

""There is a widening gap between growing concentrations of blacks and other minorities in the central cities, and whites and the expanding supply of employment opportunities in the suburbs. While exclusionary zoning controls have been seen by many as the most immediate barrier to suburban opportunities, transportation facilities and the lack of them play an important role. The federal highway program in particular, while a powerful stimulus to dispersed development, has, in its implementation, failed to protect equal access to the benefits of development such as housing and employment-benefits often made possible entirely by the provision of highway access where none existed before. As a result the comprehensive planning of metropolitan areas is seriously undermined, and new barriers are erected which threaten to perpetuate the burdens and disadvantages which a long history of racial discrimination has produced. Regional planning agencies are needed with adequate authority to make and implement integrated land-use and transportation decisions based on a clearly expressed metropolitan development policy that includes the goal of eliminating all barriers to equal access. In the interim the discriminatory aspects of current transportation policies and projects should be challenged.''
J
Identifiers: Highways as a barrier ; Minorities ; Cities, central ; Employment opportunities ; Suburbs

Print 1/5/1-13
DIALOG File15: ABI/INFORM 71-79/JAN (Item 1 of 13) User5296 5mar79

79001289 ID No: 79001289
Exclusionary Zoning
Harvard Law Review v91n7 1624-1708 May 1978 Coden: HALRAF ISSN 0017-811X Jrnl Code: HLR
Doc Type: JOURNAL PAPER

Initial use of zoning was not primarily concerned with limiting growth but with channeling development into designated areas. However, when suburban development endangered the suburban ideal and its affluent residents, suburbs predictably turned to the zoning power. This tendency has had the effect of stigmatizing the hard core urban poor as undesirable and preventing them from escaping their cycle of poverty. The traditional paradigm of zoning, endorsed by the Supreme Court, operates by encouraging some uses while excluding others. The most common example of selection zoning is the practice of discriminating in favor of single-family housing and against denser residential uses. In effect, selection zoning has increased the ability of communities to resist social change. The prospects for voluntary state and local reform of restrictive zoning are not bright. Suburban homeowners dominate the higher levels of government and the juduciary. Federal review of local zoning policies has been for the most part limited to inquiries concerning equal protection and Congressional legislation. The federal courts may also be reluctant to intervene because of doubts about judicial competence, suggesting an inability to adjudicate broad "public law" questions. It appear likely that judicial remedies in restrictive zoning cases will become more effective only as judicial experience in such cases increases.

Descriptors: Zoning: EXLUSIONARY ZONING; SUBURBAN; Zoning ordinances (RE); STATE COURT DECISIONS; Federal Court decisions; Supreme Court decisions

79001287 ID No: 79001287
Zoning and the Family
Harvard Law Review v91n7 1568-1578 May 1978 Coden: HALRAF ISSN 0017-811X Jrnl Code: HLR
Doc Type: JOURNAL PAPER

The regulation of land use affects people's choices about home and family, sometimes restricting or prohibiting certain living arrangements. In 1974, the Supreme Court sustained a zoning ordinance which prohibited more then 2 unrelated persons from living together. This ruling did not, contrary to the conclusions of many, empower a municipality to exclude groups of people solely on the ground that it finds their personal habits uncongenial. The Court's ruling relied heavily on the traditional view of the family and a municipality's right to protect that view. Recent Supreme Court decisions have emphasized the importance of state and local autonomy. The Court has stressed their roles in providing certain essential services such as education, law enforecment, and public health. Much recent state zoning litigation has involved small institutions that are responsible for social services. State courts have been generally sympathetic to homes for the mentally ill and rehabilitation centers, often ruling in their favor to the dismay of local homeowners. Courts are most protective of groups that share the essential characteristics of the family-small size and stable membership. There seems to be a tendency to protect all small-scale institutions that serve the needs of the disadvantaged even at the expense of a neighborhood's interest.

Descriptors: Constitutional law: Supreme Court decisions; Zoninn; Exclusionary zoning; Inclusionary zoning; Zoning ordinances (RE); State laws; Land use; Regulations; Social goals; FAMILY; Neighborhood zoning

79001286 ID No: 79001286
Zoning and the First Amendment
Harvard Law Review v91n7 1550-1568 May 1978 Coden: HALRAF ISSN 0017-811X Jrnl Code: HLR
Doc Type: JOURNAL PAPER

Zoning ordinances may conflict with First Amendment freedoms when they restrict the location of churches or of bookstores, theaters, and other businesses dealing in constitutionally protected material. In 1976, the Supreme Court upheld a Detroit ordinance that imposed restrictions on bookstores and theaters dealing in sexually explicit material, thereby laying the foundation for "pornography zoning." Traditionally, governments have been allowed to enact reasonable regulations concerning the place and manner of religious worship. In such instances, a balance is generally determined in the regulation between the government's interest and the extent of the restriction of the First Amendment right. Many courts once held that a municipality's interest was insufficient to exclude houses of worship from residential areas. Recently, they have become more flexible, considering possible harm to the neighborhood in relation to the restriction on religious worship. Over the years, municipalities have attempted to control the adult entertainment business by prosecuting owners under statutes outlawing obscenity, which is not protected under the First Amendment. Since the Supreme Court's 1976 decision, municipalities may single out adult bookstores and theaters for special regulatory treatment.

Descriptors: Constitutional law; BILL OF RIGHTS-US; Zoning; Exclusionary zoning; Pornography; Zoning ordinances (RE); ADULT ENTERTAINMENT DISTRICTS; Land use; Regulations; Court decisions

79001283 ID No: 79001283
The Legitimate Objectives of Zoning
Harvard Law Review v91n7 1443-1462 May 1978 Coden: HALRAF ISSN 0017-811X Jrnl Code: HLR
Doc Type: JOURNAL PAPER

From the beginning, courts have held that only certain objectives are sufficient to justify a zoning ordinance. In a 1926 ruling, the Supreme Court said that a zoning ordinance would be constitutional if it were substantially related to "public health, safety, morals, or general welfare." Since then, the Court has actually broadened its interpretation, holding in a 1954 case that land use regulations may promote "values which are spiritual as well as physical, esthetic as well as monetary." In 1974, the Court held that zoning could be used to create neighborhoods which promote "family and youth values." Still, the Court has consistently implied that the primary responsibility of defining the aims of zoning belongs to state courts. In turn, states have generally delegated zoning authority to local municipalities, specifying in the enabling statutes the objectives that may be pursued. Generally, a municipality's concern for property values takes one of 2 forms: 1. to increase the total value of the property within its borders to limit the tax burden on its citizens, and 2. to protect individual land owners against damage if an offensive use were to enter the neighborhood. Since zoning has become more complex and refined, "community character" is being viewed in a broader sense as a city's overall ambience.

Descriptors: Objectives; Social goals; Zoning; Exclusionary zoning; Inclusionary zoning; Neighborhood zoning; Zoning ordinances (RE); Land use; Regulations; Court decisions

79001282 ID No: 79001282
Developments in the Law-Zoning
Harvard Law Review v91n7 1427-1442 May 1978 Coden: HALRAF ISSN 0017-811X Jrnl Code: HLR
Doc Type: JOURNAL PAPER

Zoning is the most common technique used to contorl private property. It divides a municipality into districts and imposes restrictions on the use of land in each of them. The land use within the districts should in most cases have a cumulative effect. The simple zoning model has taken on new meaning today in response to evolving social problems. Concern for the environment and the threat of urban sprawl have led some localities to preserve semi-rural areas. Most state enabling statutes require zoning ordinances to conform to a comprehensive plan, a framework to insure rationality and consistency in the overall zoning exercise. Another principle of zoning is that regulations are to be prospective to provide protection to property which existed before the enactment of a particular regulation. A new technique is cluster zoning which allows a developer to group residential dwellings more closely than zoning ordinances would generally permit. Critics of zoning point out that most government agencies operate without strict procedural guidelines, are often politically corrupt, and frequently lack expertise in land use planning. Property owners who challenge zoning decisions are said to find little help in judicial review since courts often defer to the judgment of zoning boards. Supporters of land use control through publicly financed development regard increased dependence on state-run projects as a way to control property conflicts.

Descriptors: Objectives; Social goals; Zoning; Exclusionary zoning; Inclusionary zoning; Neighborhood zoning; Laws; Land use; Control

79001281 ID No: 79001281
Insular Majorities Unabated: Warth v Seldin and City of Eastlake v. Forest City Enterprises, Inc.
Sager, Lawrence Gene
Harvard Law Review v91n7 1373-1425 May 1978 Coden: HALRAF ISSN 0017-811X Jrnl Code: HLR
Doc Type: JOURNAL PAPER

Zoning power is one of the major tools available to the public as a determinant of the quality of life. In the last 10 years, litigation by persons excluded form decent housing opportunities by the operation of suburban land use controls has become important in the land use process. State and federal courts have assumed a more important role in the review of comprehensive zoning. Two recent Supreme Court cases, Wanth v. Seldin and City of Eastlake v. Forest City Enterprises, Inc., are indicative of the Court's direction on who should decide issues concerning the control of the use of land. With Warth, the Court set new standing requirements for federal exclusionary zoning challenges in a way likely to preclude the federal adjudication of the most significant claims of exclusion. In Eastlake, the Court validated a local rezoning referendum requirement which makes the electorate the main decision-making entity for land use matters. Warth and Eastlake together seem to be a disavowal of federal judicial qualification for review of local land use practices. They may be read as a message from the Supreme Court that the federal judiciary, except in extreme cases simply, will not respond. The cases reflect the equation of the local zoning process with the joint exercise of the prerogatives of private ownership.

Descriptors: Zoning; Exclusiorary zoning; Neighborhood zoning; Land use; Planning; Supreme Court decisions; Judiciary ; REVIEWS; Judicial reviews (LBR); Federal; Courts; Roles

78012676 ID No: 78012676
Home Sweet Suburbia
Briggs, Jean
Forbes v122n3 55-60 Aug. 7, 1978 Coden: FORBA5 ISSN 0015-6914 Jrnl Code: FBR
Doc Type: JOURNAL PAPER

Suburbia may be an idea whose time is past. As people with means flowed outward from the city, they left behind them the poor, the criminal, and the grime and bustle of business. Suburban Americans live by commerce and trade but go home at night to a landscape free of both. When industry began following the people to the suburbs, it became difficult to get someone to cut grass in the suburbs, while in the cities, able-bodied people were hanging around street corners and drawing welfare, creating a new system of discrimination that goes under another name-"zoning." As the courts have begun to strike at restrictive zoning, die-hard suburbanites have begun retreating to a second line of defense: environmentalism. People who were concerned with problems of the poor become more concerned about air and water and open spaces. The barriers are falling, however, due to: 1. the federal government's increasing willingness to use its power to withhold money from communities which are openly exlusive, 2. a mounting wave of state laws and court decisions that limit discrimination, and, 3. the sheer pressure of a bulging population.

Descriptors: SUBURBAN; Zoning; EXCLUSIONARY ZONING; NEIGHBORHOOD ZONING; SOCIAL IMPACT; CHANGES; LIFESTYLES; REGULATIONS; PLANNING; HUD; HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

78003441 ID No: 78003441
Racial discrimination and exclusionary zoning: a perspective on "Arlington Heights"
Mandelker, Daniel R.
Texas Law Review v55n7 1217-1253 Aug. 1977 Coden: TXLRA2 ISSN 0040-4411 Jrnl Code: TRX
Doc Type: JOURNAL PAPER

The governmentally fragmented character of metropolitan areas stratifies suburban municipalities socially and economically. This stratification deeply affects the way in which suburban zoning limits housing opportunities for minority groups. The Supreme Court's decision in "Arlington Heights" appears to accept this stratification, and the limitation of housing opportunity that it produces, by looking for evidence of racial discrimination only in the context of a community's application of its own zoning policies. The case for judicial intervention is appealing, but the complex policy judgments required militates against sweeping federal judicial intervention in the absence of statutory guidance. To leave the correction of such policy judgments to the political arena when socially undesirable consequences occur seems much the wiser occurs.

Descriptors: Litigation; SUPREME COURT DECISIONS; SUBURBAN; Zoning; RACIAL DISCRIMINATION; Exclusionary zoning; Municipalities

78000879 ID No: 78000879
Managing California's Coast-The Problem of Housing Distribution
Bobo, Benjamin; Shulman, David
California Mgmt Review v20n1 74-80 Fall 1977 Coden: CMNRAK ISSN 0008-1256 Jrnl Code: CMR
Doc Type: JOURNAL PAPER

Land-use control policy on California's coast and in other areas of the country has been ill-conceived and mismanaged because it has worked to the disadvantage of low-income persons by restricting, through market forces and restrictive covenants, where low and middle-income housing can be built. While one of its major goals is to provide lower-cost tourist facilities in the near coast area, more specific legislation is needed to insure that the poor are not excluded. An inclusionary land-use program is needed to prevent the California Coastal Plan from clustering the poor in the inner city and keeping them away from coastal areas through the use of market forces. Sufficient land should be designated for low-income housing, building codes should not set excessive building costs for low-income persons, a fixed specific portion of new housing should be priced for low-income families, and adequate financing should be assured.

Descriptors: LAND USE; Zoning; Exclusionary zoning; Inclusionary zoning; California; Coasts; Housing; LOW INCOME

77014211 ID No: 77014211
A NEW TEST FOR EXCLUSIONARY ZONING - DOES IT 'PRECLUDE THE OPPORTUNITY' FOR 'LEAST COST' HOUSING
ROSE, JEROME G.
REAL-ESTATE LAW JRNL VG N2 P91-103 FALL 1977 ISSN 0048-6868 Jrnl Code: REL
Doc Type: JOURNAL PAPER

THE NEW JERSEY SUPREME COURT HAS PROPOSED YET ANOTHER TEST FOR DETERMINING WHETHER A ZONING ORDINANCE IS EXCLUSIONARY, ONE WHICH SURELY WILL BE STUDIED BY THE MANY JURISDICTIONS WRESTLING WITH THIS PROBLEM. THE COURT'S INTENT WAS TO PREVENT THE KIND OF STATISTICAL WARFARE IN THE TRIAL COURTS THAT EARLIER STANDARDS HAVE FOSTERED. HOWEVER, THE NEW TEST MAY CREATE AS MANY PROBLEMS AS IT SOLVES. EVIDENCE REQUIRED FOR ISSUES OF FACT THAT MUST BE DETERMINED UNDER THE TEST WILL TEND TO MAKE THE TRIAL A LONG, DRAWN-OUT, AND EXPENSIVE PROCEDURE THAT WILL BE BASED ON HIGHLY CONTROVERSIAL ECONOMIC, SOCIOLOGICAL, AND POLICY QUESTIONS OF INNATE DIFFICULTY AND COMPLEXITY. THE EVIDENCE WILL BE BASED ON THE TESTIMONY OF EXPERTS WHOSE RESPONSES ARE APT TO BE SPECULATIVE OR CONJECTURAL. THIS IS JUST THE KIND OF PROCESS THE NEW JERSEY SUPREME COURT INDICATED THAT IT WOULD LIKE TO AVOID.

Descriptors: CITY ORDINANCES; COSTS; COURTS; ECONOMIC; EVIDENCE: EXCLUSIONARY ZONING; EXPERTS; HOUSING; JURISDICTION (LBR): NEW; NEW JERSEY; POLICIES; POLICY; PROBLEMS; PROCEDURES ; PROCESSING; PROPOSED: STANDARDS; SUPREME COURT-US; TESTIMONY ; TESTS: UNDER; ZONING; ZONING ORDINANCES (RE)

77008572 ID No: 77008572
THE EFFICIENCY OF RESTRICTIVE LAND USE INSTRUMENTS
HIRSCH, WERNER Z.
LAND ECONOMICS V53 N2 P145-156 MAY 1977 ISSN 0023-7639
Jrnl Code: LEC
Doc Type: JOURNAL PAPER

NEWCOMERS MIGHT IMPOSE UNCOMPENSATED COSTS ON A PARTICULAR JURISDICTION. THE CONSEQUENCES OF VARIOUS ARRANGEMENTS TO DEAL WITH THESE COSTS ARE DISCUSSED. WHILE LARGE LOT ZONING MAY INCREASE EFFICIENCY IN THE PRESENCE OF LOCAL PROPERTY TAXES. IT IS NOT THE MOST EFFICIENT EXCLUSIONARY INSTRUMENT. THIS ANALYSIS IS RESTRICTED TO CASES IN WHICH THE GOODS AND SERVICES WHICH CROWD ARE AUGMENTABLE. THE EFFECTS OF LOCAL PROPERTY TAX ON LAND USE ARE CONSIDERED, BOTH IN THE ABSENCE AND IN THE PRESENCE OF EXCLUSIONARY SCHEMES. THE EFFECTS OF SOME MAJOR EXCLUSIONARY INSTRUMENTS ARE EXAMINED. THESE INCLUDE LARGE LOT ZONING, POPULATION CEILINGS AND QUOTAS, AND CONSTRUCTION PERMITS. THE ECONOMIC AND LEGAL JUSTIFICATION FOR ALL LAND USE CONTROL, INCLUDING EXCLUSIONARY ZONING, IS CIRCUMVENTION OF RESOURCE MISALLOCATION BY PRIVATE MARKETS, WHETHER IT RESULTS FROM EXTERNALITIES OR MONOPOLY POWER.

Descriptors: ABSENCES; ANALYSIS; ARRANGEMENTS; CASES; CEILINGS: CONSTRUCTION: CONTROL; COSTS; ECONOMIC; EFFICIENCY; EXCLUSIONARY ZONING; INSTRUMENTS; JURISDICTION (LBR); MARKETS; MONOPOLIES; PERMITS; POPULATION; POWER; PRIVATE; PROPERTY; PROPERTY TAXES; QUOTAS; RESOURCES; RESULTS; SERVICES; TAXES; ZONING

76008327 ID No: 76008327
THE INADEQUACY OF JUDICIAL REMEDIES IN CASES OF EXCLUSIONARY ZONING
MICHIGAN LAW REVIEW V74 N4 P760-794 MARCH 1976 ISSN 0026-2234 Jrnl Code: MLW
Doc Type: JOURNAL PAPER

EXCLUSIONARY ZONING TO PROHIBIT LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROJECTS HAS BEEN A DIFFICULT PROBLEM FOR THE COURTS TO HANDLE. OFTEN THE STATE LEGISLATURES TAKE NO ACTION AGAINST SUCH PRACTICES, THUS LEAVING THE COURTS TO HANDLE IT. THE COURTS SHOULD HAND DOWN DECISIONS DESIGNED TO FORCE THE STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES TO ACT AGAINST EXCLUSIONARY ZONING PATTERNS RATHER THAN TRYING TO ENGAGE IN REZONING. THIS MAY BE DONE THROUGH A DECLARATORY JUDGMENT WHICH GRANTS THAT UNLAWFUL ZONING HAS OCCURRED, BUT IT DOES NOT GET THE COURT INVOLVED IN REZONING. YET IT LETS PROPERTY OWNERS LATER MAKE A CASE TO GET A PARCEL OF LAND REZONED, IF THEY WISH. THE MOST EFFECTIVE PLANS TO ACHIEVE ECONOMIC INTEGRATION IN THE SUBURBS SHOULD SEEK TO CHANGE LAND USE AND TO BACK SUCH EFFORTS WITH ADEQUATELY FINANCED HOUSING PROJECTS.

Descriptors: ACT; CASES; COURTS; DECISIONS; DECISIONS (LAW); ECONOMIC; EXCLUSIONARY ZONING; FORCE; HOUSING; INCOME; INTEGRATION; JUDGMENTS; LOW; LOW INCOME; MUNICIPALITIES; PROJECTS; PROPERTY; REVENUE; REZONING; STATE; STATES; ZONING

73001462 ID No: 73001462
APARTMENT ZONING TRENDS
SUSSNA, STEPHEN
APPRAISAL JRNL V 41 N 2 P 167-174 APR 73 Coden: APPJAS
ISSN 0003-7087 Jrnl Code: APJ
Doc Type: JOURNAL PAPER

U.S. CENSUS BUREAU STATISTICS SHOW SIGNIFICANT INCREASES IN THE AMOUNT OF MULTI-DWELLING UNITS BEING BUILT IN THE SUBURBS DESPITE EXCLUSIONARY ZONING. THE AUTHOR EXAMINES THE STATISTICAL, LEGAL, AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS THAT TREAT THE FINANCIAL AND RACIAL PROSPECTS OF RENTAL HOUSING IN THE SUBURBS. IN PARTICULAR, THE AUTHOR, A PLANNING CONSULTANT IN NEW JERSEY, STUDIES ZONING CASES AND FEDERAL PROGRAMS THAT FURTHER DELINEATE THE FUTURE CHARACTER OF SUBURBAN APARTMENT LIFE. ANALYZING THE RATIONALE USED BY THE COURTS AND GOVERNMENT IN THEIR RESPECTIVE ACTS. FINALLY, HE CONSIDERS FISCAL AND SOCIAL VIEWS AND CONCLUDES THAT THESE TOO ARE IN FAVOR OF SUBURBAN APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT. T. T.

Descriptors: APARTMENTS; AUTHORS; CASES; CENSUSES; CONSULTANTS; COURTS; DEVELOPMENT; DEVELOPMENTS (RE); EXCLUSIONARY ZONING; FEDERAL; FINANCIAL; FISCAL; GOVERNMENT; HOUSING; NEW; NEW JERSEY; PROGRAMS; SOCIAL; STATISTICS; STUDIES; SUBURBAN; TRENDS; ZONING

```
Print 1/2/1-19
DIALOG File7: SOCIAL SCISEARCH 72-79/WK04  (Copr. ISI Inc.) (Item    1 of   19) User5296  5mar79

892302  ARTICLE  OATS ORDER#: FV085  63 REFS
  EXCLUSIONARY  ZONING  AND  OPEN  HOUSING  -   BRIEF JUDICIAL
HISTORY  (EN)
  KING PE
  GEOGRAPHICAL REVIEW , V68, N4, P459-469, 1978
  COLUMBIA UNIV/NEW YORK//NY/10027

774059  ARTICLE  OATS ORDER#: DV038  29 REFS
  NEW  TEST  FOR  EXCLUSIONARY  ZONING  -   DOES  IT  PRECLUDE
OPPORTUNITY FOR LEAST COST HOUSING  (EN)
  ROSE JG
  REAL ESTATE LAW JOURNAL, V6, N2, P91-103, 1977
  RUTGERS STATE UNIV,LIVINGSTON COLL/NEW BRUNSWICK//NJ/

648761  BRIEF COMM  OATS ORDER#: BW257  63 REFS
  INADEQUACY  OF  JUDICIAL  REMEDIES  IN CASES OF EXCLUSIONARY
ZONING  (EN)
  MICHIGAN LAW REVIEW, V74, N4, P760-794, 1976

623823  ARTICLE  OATS ORDER#: BW478  32 REFS
  POLITICS OF EXCLUSIONARY ZONING IN SUBURBIA  (EN)
  DANIELSON MN
  POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY, V91, N1, P1-18, 1976
  PRINCETON UNIV/PRINCETON//NJ/08540

538732  ARTICLE  OATS ORDER#: AH024  40 REFS
  EXCLUSIONARY ZONING - PITFALLS OF REGIONAL REMEDY  (EN)
  BURCHELL RW; LISTOKIN D; JAMES FJ
  URBAN LAWYER, V7, N2, P262-291, 1975

514320  BOOK REV  OATS ORDER#: W0702  1 REFS
  EXCLUSIONARY  ZONING  -   LAND USE REGULATION AND HOUSING IN
1970S - BABCOCK,RF AND BOSSELMAN,FP  (EN)
  HILLMAN HD
  REAL ESTATE REVIEW, V5, N1, P125-126, 1975
  NYU/NEW YORK//NY/

514153  ARTICLE  OATS ORDER#: W0507  19 REFS
  WILL  HOUSING  MARKET  EVALUATION  MODEL  BE  SOLUTION  TO
EXCLUSIONARY ZONING  (EN)
  KELLY ED
  REAL ESTATE LAW JOURNAL, V3, N4, P373-394, 1975
  RAHENKAMP SACHS WELLS ASSOC,PUBLIC PLANNING GRP/PHILADELPHIA//PA/

508916  BOOK REV  OATS ORDER#: V8410  6 REFS
  EXCLUSIONARY  ZONING  -   LAND USE REGULATION AND HOUSING IN
1970S - BABCOCK,RF AND BOSSELMAN,FP  (EN)
  CARPENTE,RD
  URBAN STUDIES, V12, N1, P115-116, 1975
  UNIV ARIZONA/TUCSON//AZ/

502750  BOOK REV  OATS ORDER#: V3594  1 REFS
  ELIMINATING EXCLUSIONARY ZONING -  RECONCILING WORKPLACE AND
RESIDENCE IN SUBURBAN AREAS - BERGMAN,EM  (EN)
  FAGAN AM; GRANT AJ
  REAL ESTATE REVIEW, V4, N4, P126-128, 1975

447026  BOOK REV  OATS ORDER#: U0259  1 REFS
  EXCLUSIONARY  ZONING  -   LAND-USE REGULATION AND HOUSING IN
1970S - BABCOCK,RF AND BOSSELMAN,FP  (EN)
  CURRENT MUNICIPAL PROBLEMS, V16, N1, P134-134, 1974

408768  ARTICLE  OATS ORDER#: S4322  87 REFS
  SENSUOUS    MARKET    -    ANALYSIS    OF   SCHOOL   FINANCE   AND
EXCLUSIONARY ZONING  (EN)
  GELDON FM
  JOURNAL OF URBAN LAW, V51, N3, P343-404, 1974

319838  ARTICLE  OATS ORDER#: P7114  14 REFS
  BEYOND  EXCLUSIONARY  ZONING  -   PRACTITIONERS  VIEW OF NEW
ZONING  (EN)
  MEZEY FC
  URBAN LAWYER, V5, N1, P56-79, 1973

253045  ARTICLE  OATS ORDER#: Z1073  34 REFS
  CASE OF EXCLUSIONARY ZONING  (EN)
  REINSTEI,RJ; MCFADDEN G; FEDER SA; KERPER RE
  TEMPLE LAW QUARTERLY, V46, N1, P7-39, 1972
  TEMPLE UNIV,LAW SCH/PHILADELPHIA//PA/
```

```
252512  ARTICLE  OATS ORDER#: Z1046  109 REFS
  EXCLUSIONARY  ZONING  PRACTICES  -   EXAMINATION  OF CURRENT
CONTROVERSY  (EN)
  BIGHAM WH; BOSTICK CD
  VANDERBILT LAW REVIEW, V25, N6, P1111-1150, 1972
  VANDERBILT UNIV.SCH LAW/NASHVILLE//TN/37203


245043  ARTICLE  OATS ORDER#: Z0894  30 REFS
  HOME  RULE  AND EXCLUSIONARY ZONING -  IMPEDIMENT TO LOW AND
MODERATE INCOME HOUSING  (EN)
  SIMMONS P
  OHIO STATE LAW JOURNAL, V33, N3, P621-638, 1972
  OHIO STATE UNIV.COLL LAW/COLUMBUS//OH/


059703  ARTICLE  OATS ORDER#: EW302  62 REFS
  EXCLUSIONARY ZONING AND TIMED GROWTH - RESOLVING ISSUE AFTER
MOUNT LAUREL  (EN)
  WOLFSON DK
  RUTGERS LAW REVIEW , V30, N5, P1237-1259, 1977


054610  ARTICLE  OATS ORDER#: EL690  136 REFS
  RACIAL-DISCRIMINATION AND EXCLUSIONARY ZONING -  PERSPECTIVE
ON ARLINGTON-HEIGHTS  (EN)
  MANDELKER DR
  TEXAS LAW REVIEW , V55, N7, P1217-1253, 1977
  WASHINGTON UNIV/ST LOUIS//MO/63130


005631  ARTICLE  OATS ORDER#: V6284  57 REFS
  RIGHT TO TRAVEL AND EXCLUSIONARY ZONING  (EN)
  STEEL T
  HASTINGS LAW JOURNAL, V26, N3, P849-874, 1975


002741  ARTICLE  OATS ORDER#: BS957  7 REFS
  OPTIMAL CITY SIZE, ECONOMIC-THEORY OF CLUBS AND EXCLUSIONARY
ZONING  (EN)
  FISCH O
  PUBLIC CHOICE, V24, WIN, P59-70, 1975
  OHIO STATE UNIV/COLUMBUS//OH/43210
```